

THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXVIII JULY—AUGUST, 1942

No. 928

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

Summer Offensives

BY the time these notes are read, some twenty of Mr. Lyttleton's dangerous eighty days will have passed. There are the three critical fronts—Southern Russia, Egypt and the Near East, the Atlantic. Indeed, before these notes actually appear, there may be a fourth front in existence, that "second front" which has been noisily called for, and the preparation for which is certainly in progress. Russian resistance and gallantry must not blind us to the seriousness of the Russian situation. The Germans can no longer launch a general offensive all along the Russian line. Leningrad and Moscow are probably more secure from direct attack than was the case in 1941. What the Germans are trying to do is to cut off the Russian armies from their main sources of supplies. Most of the iron ore production is lost, and a great deal of the Russian aluminium. Gone too is the best arable land, in the Ukraine and latterly in the valleys of Don and Donetz. The threat to the Caucasian oil is too evident to require underlining. It is likely that the Germans have given up the hope which last year they entertained and proclaimed, the hope that they could break up and annihilate the Russian armies. Russian military leadership has shown itself more competent and skilful than the Germans—or, for that matter, we ourselves—anticipated. They are planning now to reduce their strength by gaining control of the supply lines from the South—the railways, the rivers Don and Volga, and the Caspian Sea. Then—runs the German argument—they will be able to push the Russian forces across the Volga or even as far as the Urals where they could wage merely a defensive and ineffective war. Germany's 1941 plans in Russia may have nearly succeeded. Actually they failed. There are just as many grounds for thinking that their 1942 plans, whatever the initial advantage, will equally fail. The threat to Egypt and Suez remains very real though General

Auchinleck's spirited defence and counter-attack have to some extent restored British confidence. It is heartening to read of R.A.F. superiority, less encouraging to learn of the ground superiority of the German 88 mm. guns. Rommel's moves through Libya to Egypt are intended to be co-ordinated with the German drive towards the Caucasus. What is known as the battle of the Atlantic continues. Here, as in Russia, it is principally an attack on supply lines. The week ending July 18th brought the heaviest weekly loss of shipping tonnage since the outbreak of the war, and that rate of sinking is greater than the present rate of replacement in British and American yards. The position is difficult, especially in view of the shipping that will be required for any "second front." However, there are some signs that the intensified submarine campaign will be countered with more efficient measures. The danger-spots have shifted—away from the Atlantic to the North American coast, and now that U.S.A. defensive methods have been improved, from the North American coast to the Caribbean Sea and the Northern shores of South America. But no wishful thinking will protect or increase the shipping of the United Nations.

The Indian Situation

THE Working Committee of the Congress Party in India brought forward its resolution which called for the withdrawal of British rule and went on to threaten a campaign of non-violent opposition. This was a triumph for the militant policy of Mr. Gandhi, who is said now to be "desperate." True, Mr. Gandhi and his followers pretend that they have no desire to interfere with Britain's prosecution of the war. The resolution was considered before a plenary session of Congress on August 7th. Now that it is accepted, it will doubtless provide some further ammunition for German propaganda, and, with just as little doubt, will provoke counter-measures from the Government of India. Mr. Gandhi understands that Britain's extremity is India's opportunity, but his proposals disregard entirely the facts and dangers of the actual situation. The British Government has shown its willingness to treat of major Indian issues even in the midst of war, and the mission of Sir Stafford Cripps was a guarantee of this realistic attitude. However, the British argument is that the war must first be won, and then it will be possible

for all Indians to frame a constitution, capable of embodying and maintaining the full freedom that is offered them. An article in the June number of the Irish quarterly, *Studies*—an article by a British official in a Southern Irish review—emphasizes many significant points. "The British were the first rulers to completely unify India. They were the first to establish the reign of law in place of the reign of war and rapine throughout the land. This was England's best and greatest gift to India, law and order and even-handed justice. Indian political education advanced under the influence of this reign of law." India is a continent, not a country. And most Indian leaders realise that "if they are to secure their independence, they must sink or adjust their differences without delay; but the difficulties of such a course have up to now been too great for the statesmanship or non-violence of the Indian parties." The major line of cleavage is, of course, that of Hindu and Moslem—religious in part but accentuated by the Mohammedans' reluctance to accept minority status while they consider themselves to be the most virile and martial element in the population. The Moslem position is complicated by incessant Mohammedan-Sikh quarrels: that of Congress is further embarrassed by the existence of independent and powerful Sovereign States, tenacious of their position and privileges and fortified by treaty obligations with the British Crown. Then there is the caste question which separates the Hindu from the "untouchable." What the Hindu Congress party is trying to do is to impose upon a whole Indian "continent" the ideas and methods of Western democracy with little attention to the interests and rights of ninety million Moslems and of important Native States. "The British are now prepared," continues the article, "and have been ever since the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, to hand over India to the Indians; but as British influence is the bond which holds so many discordant elements together, a crisis threatening to bring about the collapse of the structure of Indian nationality arises each time an attempt is made to transfer power to Indians." The writer of the article hoped that the threat of Japanese invasion would have welded into unity "the fissiparous elements which are now held together by the cement of British influence, and that Indian nationality, which up to now has been more an aspiration than a fact, will become real and vital." The hope has not been realised.

Incidentally, it may indicate that the Indians—or at least the Congress Party—now feel the danger of Japanese attack to be more remote than it appeared three months ago.

Japanese Intentions

THEN it was taken for granted that the Japanese would shortly launch an attack upon either India or Australia. Yet that attack has not been launched. Is this because of weather conditions? These are the typhoon months, the least favourable for naval activity in the South-West Pacific. Have the losses incurred in the Coral Sea and off Midway Island made the Japanese alter their original plans? Or have they overpassed their range of effective action? The fleets that were driven back in the two naval engagements may well have been spearheads, the first of an invasion of Australia, the second of a sudden swoop upon Hawaii. In the Pacific, time is now on the side of the United Nations. The U.S.A. has overhauled its Pacific Navy: Australia is more adequately armed and garrisoned. Australia and Hawaii, and India too, are better prepared to resist invasion than they were six months ago. It is possible however, that Japanese inaction in the Pacific may have other causes. Japan has been brought up, for several decades, on the doctrine of Japanese hegemony in what is more strictly the Far East, that is, in China and the islands of the China Seas. Japan now holds these islands. Her armed forces are in possession of the oil, tin, rubber and other products that she needs. She is consolidating her position there as rapidly and as effectively as she can. Her wildest dreams usually stopped short of India and Australia. Siam, Burma and New Caledonia—these were the limits spoken of by Mr. Matsuoka, when he was Foreign Minister: other Government officials talked of a *Lebensraum*, extending from Manchukuo southwards to the shores of Australia and westwards to the Bay of Bengal. This was the "East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere" of their national vision. The islands and seacoast they control for the time being. But there remains the problem which, for them, is the most serious of all. China still resists. China is undefeated. Japan's far-flung ambitions can never be achieved unless she can master and manage the people of China. During the past three months the main direction of Japanese activity has shifted. It is now westward rather than to the

South. The attack upon the Chinese has been intensified though it has met with gallant and effective counter-attacks from the Chinese armies. At the same time Marshal Chiang Kai-Shek's position has become more difficult. The loss of Burma has meant the closing of the Burma Road, which was at once the last regular channel of supplies to China from the outside world and a symbol of victory with the assistance of Britain and the United States. Like the Germans, the Japanese are very versatile in their general aims and strategy. Aggression where they think it will best pay—that is the prevailing idea. After their highly successful "smash and grab" campaigns in Dutch and British territory and their partially successful onslaught upon Pearl Harbour, they are tightening their hold upon the land they have seized. Their hope is that the United Nations will be far too occupied now—and far too isolationist later—to make the necessary efforts to dislodge them. Meanwhile, they are turning the full force of their offensive upon the Chinese.

An Interesting Note

FATHER BERNARD HUBBARD, S.J., is an expert upon Alaska and its problems. His research work in geography and physiography has been recognized by the highest academic quarters in the United States. Writing in a recent number of *America* he gives it as his opinion that Alaska is the keystone of American victory in the Pacific. From the defence standpoint, "Alaska has some very excellent hornet's nests, some complete, others nearly so, but all sufficient for the job in hand. Let me repeat here a reasonably established axiom: 'Whoever is in Alaska first has it.' Our armed forces are definitely there, and definitely are in control of the present situation, as well as prepared for any possible emergency that may arise." He discounts the practical possibility of Japanese landings on the Alaskan coast. "At the very best, Japan could only hope to seize some coastal areas, more to keep us from using these bases against them, than to enable them to use them effectively against us." His notion of the American road to Pacific victory is "a bomber route from the United States along the inside of the Rockies in Canada; then along the Yukon and up the Seward Peninsula fifty-four miles from East Cape Siberia to the end of Kamchatka, which is but a few hundred miles from northern Japan and within

practical bombing distance of vital Japanese industries." This supposes, of course, Russian co-operation, and consequently it is strategy for the future rather than the immediate present. Father Hubbard informs us that the Aleutian Islands provide good bases for submarines but no good fields for aeroplanes. "Submarines do not need good weather: aeroplanes do. The Aleutians are not only the stormiest areas in the world, but you often have wind and low impenetrable fog existing together. There is a blanket of thick weather about 200 miles wide and 1,200 miles long, usually enveloping the Aleutian chain due to the cold water of the Bering Sea on one side and the warm water of the Japanese current on the other. . . . Many a time when my exploring party tried to climb an Aleutian volcano, three to five weeks of rain, mist and wind held us up. These would be serious handicaps for any use of the Aleutians as land bases for airplanes." Father Hubbard concludes his illuminating article with an exhortation to patience. "In the Pacific our enemies have prepared for forty years to do what they are now doing. We have only been preparing a few months and are already impatient to win. We want to win the war in two months. Our Chinese allies know they will win in 200 years. Let us combine our ingenuity and aggressiveness with their patience and we shall win the war efficiently and reasonably."

This "Fascist" Business

I SHOULD like to see those twin words "Fascist" and "anti-Fascist" dropped altogether except in reference to Italy. They are misleading and are, I fear, at times deliberately so. The Italian axe and bundle of fasces are a romantic throw-back to the old Roman Empire. In so far as there is a definite philosophy behind it, this is Hegelian and a re-hash of Prussian ideas about the absolute State. "Nothing against the State: nothing outside the State: nothing without the State"—this Fascist dictum sums up their general aspiration. And yet the Catholic character and traditions of the Italian people, together with their human qualities, have provided a counterbalance to this would-be-totalitarianism, with the result that the Italians have never been indoctrinated and perverted to the same extent as have the Germans under Nazi education and propaganda. Hitler may have borrowed something from Fascist Italy; he has

taken a great deal more from Bolshevik Russia. Our chief enemy in Europe is German National-Socialism or—what comes to the same thing—National-Socialist Germany. We are fighting against a country that is organized for peace and war on totalitarian lines, reinforced by violent national and racial feeling. Socialism in method, i.e., rigorous State control, coupled with strong nationalistic sentiment—these are the two main ingredients of the Nazi and the Fascist systems. Add to these a third and highly important factor, namely that the State—and consequently the people—is controlled by one single political party to the exclusion of every other formative influence. You have this in Germany; you find it in Russia; it exists though in a milder and less effective manner, in Italy. But why give it that vague and unconvincing label—"Fascism"? What is wrong with its real name—"National-Socialism"?

Our Propaganda Problems

BBRITISH propaganda to the peoples of the Continent has to deal with many awkward problems. We have to avoid anything that might be construed as anti-Russian. We are hampered by the absence of any more tangible and concrete programme than the eight principles of the Atlantic Charter. The purpose of propaganda, as a fifth arm, is *negatively* to encourage resistance to the enemy Government, to discover and accentuate lines of difference, and to disillusion the enemy public about its own propaganda. *Positively*, its object should be to show the enemy public that it would have something to gain from our victory: this positive programme is exceedingly difficult. Propaganda depends for its success, first of all, on a real appreciation of the situation within the enemy country. It is little use talking to non-existent audiences or stressing arguments that have no appeal. It is a mistake to think too much in terms of German political parties before 1933. It is a mistake to imagine that there are large numbers of former Social-Democrats or even Centre Party members who, on purely political grounds, think to-day as they thought ten years ago. Times have changed very rapidly, and the average *émigré* is slow to understand how swift that change has been. American journalists who left Germany at the end of 1941 and have since recorded their impressions give little support to the belief that these *ci-devant*

parties have any significance now or are, in any sense, our political allies within the Reich. There is plenty war-weariness and discontent: but it is on a deeper level than that of political differences. Some Communist activity can be detected—generally underground and on no large scale. In the event of serious reverses, there is a ready line of cleavage between the Nazis and the Prussian military caste. But this military caste has to be rendered impotent every bit as much as the Nazi Party. The clearest and the only open resistance to the Nazis comes from the Catholic Church and from members of the Protestant Confessional Church. The opposition is religious and based on religious grounds: this means that it is limited to matters that are religious or are concerned with religious needs and principles. In Germany as in most of the occupied countries the anti-Nazi core is a definitely Christian one. The various pastoral letters of the past twelve months—from the Archbishops and Bishops of Munich, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Trier, Münster and Berlin—reveal a determination to combat direct Nazi interference with Church affairs. But as far as an Allied victory goes, too much emphasis should not be placed upon these protests. They have frequently ended with an appeal for a German effort and an expressed desire for German victory. We must remember that Hitler's attack upon Russia, although it failed lamentably to inspire any anti-Bolshevik crusade, has complicated the war issue for German, and generally for European, Catholics. None the less, it is evident that there are large circles—Christian and especially Catholic—within Germany to which an appeal on Christian and Catholic lines would be very telling. This appeal ought to be stressed and extended.

Pointers from Sweden

DR. BELL, the Anglican Bishop of Chichester, has recently visited Sweden, where he was able to make contact with Swedish public men and religious leaders. In his diocesan magazine he records a summary of his impressions. The people of Sweden are overwhelmingly opposed to Nazi plans and principles. They are—to something like 90 per cent.—anti-German and favourably disposed towards Britain. Their sympathy with their oppressed Norwegian neighbours is very deep-seated, and they have watched with anxiety and disgust the Nazi-Quisling attempts to secure control

of the Lutheran Church in Norway and of the Norwegian school system. In their eyes many of Norway's pastors and school teachers are Christian heroes, as indeed they are. At the same time they are afraid of Russia and are suspicious lest Russia be harbouring designs for a kind of Russian *Lebensraum* in the Baltic. Their fear is that Russia will annex the smaller Baltic States—Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, with possibly a part or the whole of Finland. For the Swedes Russia is the historic enemy. And to-day this age-old tension is aggravated by the marked opposition between Swedish democratic ideas and Russian Communism. In our last issue we commented upon these supposed designs of Russia under the heading of "An Eastern Munich": they had been given prominence in the American press. However, the terms of the Anglo-Russian Alliance appear to rule out these dangers and Mr. Eden has given the assurance that there were no secret clauses attached to the treaty. Late in July, the Norwegian Government in London announced the general directives of its post-war policy. These show a partial turning away from the former conception of a Scandinavian Entente between Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland and the desire to be more closely associated with Britain and the United States. It is the Norwegian Government's hope that their country may serve as a bridge, economically and politically, between these Western Powers and Soviet Russia.

This Christian Resistance

WE have stated above that the core of resistance to Nazi oppression in occupied countries is a Christian one. This is evident in Norway where various measures are being used to overcome it. The Norwegian Bible Society is no longer permitted to buy paper: this will mean that all printing of Bibles in Norway must come to an end. The Lutheran paper *Dagen*, which was recently converted from a daily into a weekly, is now forced to cease publication. The Swedish paper *Svenska Dagbladet* (June 12th) announced that the first two Quisling bishops—Lars Andreas Froeyland and Ludvig Dase Zwiilgmeier—were to be consecrated in an Oslo church on June 28th, and that Nazi formations and the Quisling *Hird* organization were to take part in the ceremony. "The Church Department tried to induce Bishop Stoeren

to perform the consecration, but Stoeren refused. The Department also considered inviting some foreign bishop but the plan was abandoned. It was realised that it was futile to ask a Nordic bishop to come to Oslo under present circumstances. Dean Lothe, appointed by Quisling, is now acting as Bishop of Trondhjem and will perform the consecration. It is the first time in the history of the Norwegian that a dean will consecrate a bishop." The same paper writes: "The Church Department in Oslo has ordered the Norwegian clergy to arrange local commemoration services in the home districts of those volunteers who have fallen on the Eastern Front. The orders, however, have not been carried out, and a few N.S. (Nasjonal Samling) pastors have been ordered to travel round the countryside to arrange these services. Only a few persons attended them, and the Quisling press complains that the Norwegian people do not share the grief of the families of these fallen soldiers." On Whit-Sunday special prayers were recited for the "deposed" Lutheran Primate, Dr. Berggrav, and for the teachers in prison or concentration camps. Afterwards some of the clergy were questioned by the police. Several were forbidden to preach; others are now under house arrest. The Quisling police are making use of this form of detention for clergymen—to avoid attracting popular notice and resentment. Similar resistance, both Catholic and Protestant, continues in Holland and Belgium. In the East there rages a veritable persecution of the Catholic Church in Poland and Slovenia. Many dioceses have only a small proportion of their former priests. Churches have been shut or confiscated. In Yugoslavia other methods have been applied to discredit Catholics. Priests and religious have been compelled to demolish sacred buildings belonging to the Orthodox. The intention is that the odium incurred by this shall fall upon Catholic shoulders, not upon those of the occupying Germans and Italians. Against these measures the Croat bishops have energetically protested. They will have nothing to do with "mass" or "forced" conversions and they have denounced the appointment by local authorities (under Italian or Pavelitch control) of so-called missionaries to interfere with the Orthodox. They insist that the Orthodox should be guaranteed their civil rights, the right to hold property and the right of personal freedom. They urge that "the destruction of Orthodox churches and chapels and the seizing of private property

should be forbidden." Speaking once again of converts, they state: "only those can be received who decide to enter the Catholic Church of their own free will and from their own conviction of the truth of Catholic doctrines."

Christian Co-operation

A FURTHER consequence of this Christian opposition to the Nazis is the development of co-operation between Catholics and Protestants on the Continent. Reports from Germany tell of joint visits of protest paid to Government departments by Catholic bishops and high Protestant dignitaries. In Holland, what was once known as "the monstrous alliance" of Catholics and Calvinists in the political field—to which are owed, politically, the privileges enjoyed by Dutch denominational schools—is now even more stoutly sealed. The Catholic hierarchy and the Calvinist authorities in Holland speak with equal firmness and in very similar terms. The anti-Christian character of Nazism, with all its words and works, is bringing Christians together, with an urgent sense of their common danger and of the need of a common defence. It was this appreciation of the spiritual issues involved in the present war that prompted Cardinal Hinsley to establish the Sword of the Spirit, the purpose of which was to convince Catholics in this country of the reality of those spiritual issues, and to work with non-Catholic Christians and generally with men of good will who could and would understand what those issues were. It was co-operation under special circumstances, and now the bases of that co-operation have been worked out and set down in the Joint Statement that was first issued on May 28th. The statement has provoked helpful discussion in the religious press. One of the most valuable contributions to the discussion is made by Canon Mahoney in the July issue of the *Clergy Review*, where he incidentally—and as an appendix to his article—gives us the text and translation of recent Papal pronouncements that touch the whole question. He draws an interesting parallel with *Singulari Quadam*, the Papal document of 1912 which dealt with the question of Catholic membership in France and Germany of non-Catholic or mixed trade unions. The Pope recognized the necessity of such mixed associations, and permitted Catholics to belong to them, provided they were safeguarded from false social teaching and belonged as well to some Catholic labour organization. The parallel with to-day would be that Catholics should join the

Sword of the Spirit, and "under its guidance members may securely collaborate with non-Catholic associations *in the field of natural law and social reconstruction.*" There is, however, one big difference between the two situations, Canon Mahoney allows. "*Singulari Quadam* was rather a grudging toleration, whereas the papal encyclicals of the last few years contain an urgent appeal for collaboration, owing to the magnitude of the dangers threatening us all." Dr. Mahoney emphasizes the clause "in the field of natural law and social reconstruction," and that is *de facto* the sphere in which collaboration is envisaged. He continues with the suggestion that "it may well happen, after a period of successful co-operation within the sphere of the natural law, that the way will be paved for some measure of agreement on objects specifically Christian, though there are imposing difficulties in the way." In this number of *THE MONTH*, Father Maurice Bévenot, S.J., Professor of Fundamental Theology at Heythrop College, tries to outline some basic agreement on specifically Christian things which he considers can be found in the existing religious situation in England. He does not deny—and indeed it is not in question—that the actual field of co-operation is that of social and international reform and reconstruction, in other words a field that might be considered sufficiently covered by the Natural Law and its consequences drawn under Christian inspiration—a field in which the "good pagan" could quite well co-operate with us. His argument is that although we might conceivably hold these various principles and make these judgments on the basis of the Natural Law, we do in fact hold and make them because we are Christians. And these principles and judgments we share, to a large extent, with our non-Catholic and still Christian brethren. And all this because of something that we hold in common, in spite of many and serious divergencies. Father Bévenot's article is meant to contribute to the valuable discussion that has been occasioned and inspired by the problems of co-operation.

Spanish Problems

THE German radio has more than once reported that the Spanish monarchy is shortly to be restored in the person of Don Juan, a younger son of the late King Alfonso. This is significant because it could scarcely be to the advantage of the Nazis. It is widely admitted by those who understand

the present Spanish situation that the one way-out is that of a monarchical restoration. War conditions have made reconstruction in Spain none too easy. General Franco is a highly gifted soldier : he has been less successful as the head of a post-war administration. The Spanish character is hard and not given to compromise. Opposition has not been conciliated. The number of political enemies in concentration camps is alarmingly large. With the exception of two short intervals Spain has always been a kingdom : and, to draw a parallel with Italy, the House of Savoy has provided, and provides, a definite and a very popular check upon the activities of Mussolini and his Fascists. A restoration of the monarchy in Spain would smooth out many present difficulties and might well take Spain further from the Axis orbit. The recent re-establishment of the Cortes as a Parliamentary Chamber is in itself a healthy sign. The Cortes of the immediate future will be under Falangist influence and will follow the lines of an Italian corporative chamber. Describing this new Cortes, General Franco declared that it would consist of ministers, officials, mayors, professional and trade union delegates together with a number of representatives of the social and cultural life of Spain. It is not a step in the direction of "democracy." On the contrary General Franco is reported as saying that the totalitarian system had shown its superiority in the military field and that only a totalitarian régime can save the Spaniards from economic ruin. A puzzling assertion when one remembers how Germany's totalitarianism is ruining the greater part of the continent. There are some Spaniards, continued the Caudillo, who consider that the solution of Spain's difficulties must come from abroad. "They forget that the great problem of Europe is that of Communism. The present conflict creates such great problems that we may affirm with certainty that their solution will not be found in the liberal-democratic system." Unhappily, there was no reference to the dangers of Nazism such as there has been in recent addresses of Spanish bishops. There was no word to deplore the anti-Christian and anti-human Nazi policy in Catholic countries such as Poland and Slovenia. General Franco has fought for the national independence of Spain. Is he left unimpressed by the fact that other European countries are fighting to-day for their national "right to life and independence." (he should recognize the expression) against a frightful and savage aggressor? Doubtless he has to handle and mollify a difficult neighbour, since Germany is neighbour

now to Spain. This may explain. Does it—and how far does it excuse?

Hitler's Smaller Allies

THE *Tablet* of July 25th included a few stern and well-merited remarks concerning Hungary. "Now that so much of the Hungarian irredentist claims have been met by the Axis, and now that the Little Entente is no more than a memory, the Hungarians are doing all that they can to ensure that when the war is over they will again be encircled by neighbours who hate them." At the end of the last war Hungary was treated severely and unwisely. Too much territory was taken from her. Conscious of her former status as one of the two dominating partners in the Dual Monarchy, she remained resentful, her one policy that of treaty revision. She drew near, first of all to Italy and later, though with some misgiving, to Nazi Germany. She has now been drawn into the Nazi orbit, probably more closely than any other country: and with the Nazis she will, in every likelihood, stand or fall. Geography accounts in large measure for this unfortunate situation, but there was always a certain understanding between the Hungarian and Prussian military classes. Hungary is also the one smaller Axis ally that can point to substantial gains from her association with the Axis. She has recovered a large portion of Transylvania; she has avoided having to send large numbers of troops to the Russian front. But she has behaved, and is behaving, brutally to the Serbs: she is mistrusted by the Slovaks who have recently revived an *entente* with Rumania. The Croats are suspicious of Hungarian ambitions in the South, while Rumanian and Hungarian troops face one another along their common frontier. To quote one further sentence from the *Tablet*, "when the third member of the Little Entente—the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes—is restored, it will have a hatred towards the Hungarians which will vastly exceed that of the past: a hatred of which the Hungarians are to-day deliberately sowing the seed." The war will have shaken badly the traditional friendship of Poles and Magyars, and the inevitable Slav preponderance in any post-war federation in East-Central Europe will check Hungarian ambition to be a *Herrenvolk* along the Danube. Unfortunately it seems that Hungary must succeed or fail with the Axis. While the Hungarians have drawn some temporary advantages from association with the Axis, Rumania's experience of the same

ass
up
e
de
Th
ter
int
the
Ma
pe
bei
me
and
sam
mig
the
yet
ate
of t
cont
of M
thes
for
Fron
that
plea
open
Bulg
and

Fren

T
throu
peopl
good
relati
worse
hesita
Unite
are r
no hin
Bolsh
in R

association has been decidedly unhappy. Before the attack upon Sevastopol, in which Rumanian troops were heavily engaged, their military losses amounted officially to 140,000 dead and wounded : the figure is probably an understatement. The Rumanians have been compelled to cede considerable territory to Hungary. In fact, the only enemy they have any interest in fighting is across the frontiers of Hungary. Politically, the country is confused. Some of the older politicians, like Maniu and the Bratianus, are openly anti-German. The people feel that they were betrayed by King Carol and are being betrayed under the Antonescus ; they harbour resentment towards both Germany and Britain. Their industry and oil are controlled and exploited by the Germans. At the same time they cannot look towards Russia for salvation as might the Serbs and eventually too the Bulgars. In Bucharest the present is sombre, the future a most uneasy one. And yet it must be noticed that Rumania has made efforts to alleviate the terrible economic conditions in Greece by the despatch of trains laden with wheat. This is in human and decent contrast with the behaviour of the Bulgars in the portions of Northern Greece which they have occupied. Italy and these minor satellites of Nazidom offer their various excuses for not sending larger contingents of soldiers to the Eastern Front. Italy exaggerates her Balkan difficulties and claims that she requires all her troops to deal with them. Hungary pleads the defence of Transylvania, and the Bulgars argue that open war between Russia and themselves might stir up a Bulgarian revolution. Rumania has been the last plausible and successful in her evasions.

French Problems

THE prestige of the United States is very high in France, and the evident American determination to see the war through to victory has profoundly impressed the French people. Marshal Pétain was always careful to remain on good terms with the American Government, and, although relations between Vichy and Washington have inevitably worsened since America's full entry into war, Laval has hesitated to court further odium by open opposition to the United States. In the occupied coastal districts the Germans are running an anti-American newspaper campaign ; but no hint of this appears in the Vichy Press. The French anti-Bolshevik Legion that was recruited originally for service in Russia, has been renamed the Tricolor Legion. The

Germans and the collaborationists hope to employ it to resist any "second front" invasion of French soil. It will be used—one Paris journal threatens—"not only against Russian barbarism, but also against American imperialism or Anglo-Saxon avidity." The strength of this self-styled "Tricolor" Legion is not known: what is known is that it is intensely unpopular in France, both Occupied and Unoccupied. In the latter part, anti-Nazi sentiment has been violently increased by the latest measures taken against French Jews. More than 20,000 of these have been rounded up, and several hundreds have already been deported from France to Poland. In France, as in Holland and Belgium, there are many indications of strong sympathy with the Jews, now that these have been selected for particularly brutal treatment by the Nazis. The food situation remains very grave. The Germans requisition what they want, and leave for French consumption what is definitely insufficient for French needs. French official rations are very low. The result, a widely-developed Black Market which it is in no one's interest to suppress. Great pressure is being put on Laval and the Vichy Government to secure skilled French labour for German factories. The Germans are short of man-power. But the French workmen will not go, in spite of the inviting conditions of labour and wages held out to them. Up to the end of July less than 20,000 workers had travelled to Germany from both zones of France, taken together. The recruiting offices, opened specially to attract 350,000 volunteers, stand empty and idle. This has led to increased tension between Vichy and Berlin, and reports declare that Laval has attempted to persuade Pétain to have this number of workmen made available by some kind of conscription; the reports add that the Marshal has refused. For some time French factories were working on a short-time basis. This the Germans have now stopped. Laval has announced that French industry is to be rationalized, that 1,700 factories are to be shut immediately, and that several thousand more will be closed in the near future. The workmen thrown out of employment must find work on the land or take up work in Germany. The German Labour Front which would naturally absorb and control all French workmen sent to the Reich, is attempting to get a stranglehold on French industry. The French are suffering severely. Their resistance to German pressure and exploitation is growing firmer. It is increasingly clear to them that their one hope consists in a full victory of the United Nations.

CHRIST IN INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE¹

TO speak of Christ in industry and commerce is to assume that there is a place for Christ in economic life ; that He is—or can be—"in" industry and commerce. To Christians, of course, there should be nothing surprising in this assertion ; yet it certainly runs counter to a very common opinion. Our assumption is in open contradiction with the idea that the sphere of industry and commerce is, from the religious point of view, a sort of no-man's-land ; in other words, that economic activities are ruled by economic laws, *and by those alone*, save in so far as the law of the land may modify them. In practice, this is, of course, modified by a certain amount of humanitarian feeling and by respect for an ill-defined ethical code ; but the claim that the business-world can and should be pervaded and inspired by Christianity is only too often met by polite incredulity and dismissed as amiable sentimentalism. The world of business is a hard tough world, full of conflict between people who are engaged in a continual struggle to improve their financial position, to keep their heads above water, or to get as big a slice of the cake as they can. To such people (and they are the great majority of our population) Christianity must be presented for what it is—a hard tough religion, not a cloud of sentimentality ; thoroughly realist, not a utopian dream. Above all, not as something which is a counsel of perfection, above the head of the ordinary man and woman, but as a matter of strict duty, to be rejected only at the cost of individual and social peace, progress and welfare.

Whether the secularist mentality likes it or not, the business-world can claim no exemption from the sovereignty of Christ. It cannot plead that production, distribution and exchange are processes having no relation to religion ; or, if that plea is put forward, it misses the all-important point that these processes are simply the activities, mental and physical, of human persons ; and that these persons are acting as they do because they have conscious purposes in their minds.

¹ A lecture delivered during the Christian Front Week at Nottingham.

At once it follows, if we are not to reject the Christian faith, that great issues are at stake in the economic field. The welfare of men and women with immortal souls is intimately bound up with problems of industrial and commercial organization, administration and policy. Whether they be employers or employed, skilled or unskilled, directors, managers, shareholders, technicians, clerical or manual workers, they are all called to be co-heirs with Christ and to enter His eternal kingdom. All, whether they know it or not, have been redeemed by Him from the slavery of sin. All are weak, all are tempted, all have the terrible power of choosing evil; yet all, too, in the depths of their souls have an ineradicable longing for perfect happiness, which can only come from possession of the Infinite Good. They are not mere wheels in the economic machine, not mere robots performing tasks in factories, offices or shops. They are human persons; *each* of them is a person, for ever distinct from all the others and of far greater worth than the most exquisite or ingenious or magnificent of the works of man's hands. And just because they are persons, with the power of free choice that comes from the natural gift of reason, they have duties and they have rights; and just because they are *created* persons, those duties and rights are but means by which they are, with the help of their Creator, to fulfil His eternal design for them, for *each* of them. One does not need to be a Christian to believe in the transcendent value of the human person; many who would not call themselves Christians have fought and are still fighting a great fight to prevent men, women and children being treated as though they were mere chattels, and to vindicate the claims of human personality in the economic and social order. But Christianity gives those claims a foundation far deeper and stronger than any secularist theory can discover; nor can its representatives cease to voice them.

The fact, then, that the business-world is a complex of relations between *persons* is one of the reasons why Christ is rightly said to be "in industry and commerce."

Another reason (or perhaps the same reason from a somewhat different point of view) is that our economic system implies an organization of persons for the achievement of a definite purpose—the provision of goods (including services) to satisfy the demands of consumers. That is the purpose of the system as a system, though the purposes of the persons

within it, their individual motives, are of all sorts and kinds, varying with their personal attitude to life. Whether we consider the purpose of the system itself, or the motives of those engaged in it, it is evident that the Christian faith is very relevant indeed. Is it the function of industry to satisfy, to the best of its ability, any and every demand at no matter what cost in human suffering to the producers and in moral or physical injury to the consumers? Or is society entitled to intervene to prohibit or regulate the manufacture or sale of certain commodities? Does a strong demand for cheap clothing justify the employment of labour at sweated wages? or the employment of young children in textile factories? May the hours of labour in shops, mines, offices or factories be limited by law to a certain number even though demand for the product of labour is strong enough to justify a longer working day? May the sale of certain types of commodity, e.g., cocaine, be legally restricted, notwithstanding the existence of an unsatisfied demand for them?

The fact that in civilized countries the law does intervene to regulate methods of production and sale is evidence that it has been found necessary to have some standard to which the economic system is subordinate, and by reference to which its activities can be judged. That standard is usually stated to be the welfare of the community and its members. But what exactly is this welfare? To ask this is to raise the question of the meaning of life, and therefore of the claims of Christ upon men. Those who reject those claims will not accept the Christian idea of human welfare; but they cannot deny that, since it is the function of the economic system to contribute to human welfare, Christianity is entirely logical in maintaining that its standards apply in the economic field as elsewhere, and that by those standards it must judge the true purpose of the economic system and the way in which it actually functions.

That industry and commerce cannot claim independence of Christ is even more obvious when we consider the individual motives of those engaged in them. Christ claims the allegiance of men's wills, and their motives are the aims on which their wills are set. Men do not cease to be men, their duty to seek only what is pleasing to their Creator is not lessened, merely because they enter industry or commerce. Before they are bankers, or stockbrokers, or accountants, manufacturers or operatives, they are, first and foremost, *men*,

with all that this implies according to nature and the Christian faith. There is, in the real world, no such person as "the economic man," who lives and moves and has his being solely in the economic order. The economic man was never more than the bloodless abstraction of certain economists, and he is generally considered to have outlived his usefulness, if he ever had any. He has been relegated to the shades; appropriately enough, for he was always rather shady.

The sovereignty of Christ, then, extends over industry and commerce because the economic system includes a constant flow of purposive human activities, and is an organization of persons which has developed and exists for a human purpose.

But what does this sovereignty mean in practice? It means that the economic system and the activities of all engaged in it must be such as Christ would have them to be, that there is a strict duty incumbent upon all in industry and commerce to discover His will in regard to their conduct and their plans, and then to conform themselves to it, at no matter what cost to themselves of comfort, wealth or power. Put in these stark terms, Christianity is seen to be (what I have already called it) a hard, tough religion. It is a travesty of Christianity to pretend that it contents itself with making gentle sentimental recommendations about general goodwill, or what not. It makes severe demands on human nature, for it demands self-sacrifice. It has no tolerance for our slothfulness, our avarice, our dishonesty, our innate selfishness. Certainly it promises divine forgiveness for them, but only on condition that we repent and turn over a new leaf. It claims that if men submit themselves to Christ, with all of self-denial that this implies, they will find a new and far more spacious world opening before them, they will have a new insight into the meaning of the happiness they are ever pursuing, they will discover that they can have it by putting Christ first in their lives. And Christianity claims that this is true not only of the individual but of society as a whole, and of every organization within the State. Even those who are most sceptical about these claims must admit that experience has taught us the grievous and bitter fruits of secularism in social and economic life. These are only too well-known to a world tormented by conflicts between nations and between classes, and by the clash and clangour of economic and financial warfare. From this terrible

turmoil, international and social, there is but one road of escape : acceptance of a law, binding on all, reconciling the just interests of all, higher than mere State-law, having as its purpose the true welfare of every human being, and capable of realizing that purpose. And what can that be but the law of God, the fulfilment of which is Christ's will for men ?

At this point we encounter a difficulty of some importance, for if it were valid it would undermine all that has been said above. Even admitting, it may be said, that the will of Christ should rule in the economic field as in other departments of life, how are we to know that will in detail ? Christ has not left us a code of conduct in economic affairs. There is no recorded saying of His about strikes or lockouts, the joint-stock system, nationalization of the means of production, production committees or joint industrial councils, and so on.

This difficulty is not peculiar to economic activities. It could be raised with reference to our educational, legal or political institutions. We have no recorded saying of Christ about trial by jury, constitutional government or State schools. Indeed, He does not give a complete and detailed code of conduct even for individual life. His principles are universal, applicable to all times and all places, but to be applied to varying conditions and circumstances by men with the help of the Holy Spirit. He is speaking not only *about* persons but *to* persons, that is, to beings to whom God has given intellects, and therefore the power to apply principles to particular cases ; indeed, to discover principles for themselves. In other words, divine revelation is not the only source of knowledge. God speaks too by the light of reason, and when on any point revelation is silent it is for the human intellect to supply guidance. This is simply the traditional doctrine of " the law of nature," which Christianity accepted from the thinkers of the ancient world, and placed on a firmer foundation than they knew. It is called the law of nature because its precepts, perceived by the human intellect reflecting on man's nature, express the true dynamism of that nature, and guide it to its perfection ; and because God is the author of nature He is also the author of this law. Christ's teaching enables us to perceive the law of nature more clearly ; His life and death give us new motives for obeying it. He has added to it only those precepts which concern the Christian faith and sacraments. Far from

abrogating it, He has given it a new strength and splendour by His own example.

So when problems of right and wrong arise in the field of industry and commerce, as in any other field of human activity, they are to be solved by using our minds to the best of our ability to apply the great principles of Christ's teaching and the law of nature. This is not the place to discuss those principles in detail. For our present purpose they can be summed up under two heads ; the transcendent value of the human person with its rights and duties, and the brotherhood of all men ; or, in terms of morality, justice and charity. Without entering into an analysis of these two social virtues, it may be briefly said that justice imposes upon every person (including the community as a "moral person") the duty to respect the rights of every other person (again including the community), while the specifically Christian virtue of charity requires us to love all men as Christ has loved us.

We must be realistic, and admit that there are difficulties—often great difficulties—in the practice of these virtues. Of course the first difficulty to spring to mind is the weakness and selfishness of our wills, which are no less in the industrial and commercial community than elsewhere. Everybody, said a great theologian centuries ago, talks about justice and praises it ; but it is another thing to practise it. And we may say the same of charity. But there is a further difficulty, familiar to conscientious folk ; and that is, to know exactly what justice or charity requires of us in a given situation, particularly when the circumstances are complicated and it is a question of reconciling opposing claims. This is a situation not unfamiliar in the economic world. It arises, for instance, when the claims of shareholders to at least some return on their money have to be weighed against the claims of employees to a decent wage. The history of our railways in recent years is full of this conflict. It arises when the interests of the community appear to clash with those of a section of its members. Every large-scale strike or lock-out illustrates this. So does the recent dispute about the means test. So does any scheme for the expropriation of private owners, as we saw when the question of compensation for the nationalization of coal royalties arose, and when the London Passenger Transport Board was formed. He would be a bold man who would say that all such problems have been settled in the past in accordance with Christian principles

of justice and charity ; or that the Christian solution is always so clear that only the selfishness and avarice of the parties concerned can explain divergencies from it. The fact is that the application of moral principles is not always an easy matter, even given good will. It is almost a science ; and what we lack nowadays is a body of trained men able to help in the task—men, that is, familiar with Christian principles and with the facts of industrial life, and trained to apply the former to the latter. In default of such a body, probably the most we can hope for is that the solution of various conflicts of economic interests which is arrived at after careful discussion between those concerned will not be too dissimilar to the ideal Christian solution ; though too often it will be at best only a compromise.

One thing is absolutely certain, that no Christian worthy of the name can be satisfied until those engaged in industry and commerce, in whatever capacity, recognize in practice (and not merely in word) that no economic system is acceptable which treats human beings as if they were machines, and not *persons*. Of course, as I have already said, Christians are by no means alone in insisting on the claims of human personality. It is being more and more realized that, even from the purely economic standpoint, it is a blunder to overlook the *personnel* side of production. Hence the development of welfare work and of trained people to undertake it. Hence too we see the beginnings of a movement to show workers how their particular output is integrated into the finished product. I quote a recent example of this. In Lancashire some hundreds of girls were engaged in twisting, doubling and winding cotton. Few of them had any idea of the use to which this was put. An exhibition was staged which showed tyre cord, as it left the mill, being used as reinforcement of a Spitfire tyre, cotton fabric incorporated in sea-boots worn by coastguards, etc. (*Manchester Guardian*, May 19th, 1942). It is part of the same new tendency that our air-pilots and our tank-drivers should be brought into the works where their machines are produced in order to get into touch with the operatives. Last century it was the elementary rights of the industrial workers which had to be fought for. This fight has been to a great extent won, though not entirely, particularly with regard to wages. Psychologically too there has been progress ; the idea that the workers are no more than mere hands would be openly

defended by hardly anyone to-day. The statement that they are persons would not be looked on as irrelevant to industry. What is now needed is elucidation and acceptance of all the implications of that statement ; as of the complementary truth that all other classes in industry and commerce are persons too.

When we claim that human beings must always be treated as persons, we mean that they must be treated by all their fellow-beings as Christ treats them, with genuine desire to promote their best and truest interests. It does not mean weak connivance at their shirking their duties and responsibilities, whether they be employers or employed, or whatever other function they perform ; but it does mean a scrupulous respect for the rights given them by God. It would be interesting to work this out in detail, and to apply it to test the wage system, the joint-stock company, claims of the workers to share in the control of industry, relations between the State and industry, and so forth ; but I must refrain. The main point I am trying to make is the necessity of "personizing" relations in industry and commerce. Let me quote from a letter sent by an assistant manager describing conditions in his firm :

Operatives *en masse* are very well treated from the physical point of view and remuneration. Individually, they hardly exist. The management is benevolent, but interested in technology and statistics rather than in individuals. . . . The employees take to official welfare as a matter of course and have no interest in it. They feel they are part of a vast machine which runs like a clock, without human personality, never seeing them, never blaming them, never praising them, never penalising them, never rewarding them, never driving them, never exhorting them, but expressing itself impersonally from time to time like a book of rules. ["People in Production ; A Report prepared by Mass-Observation" ; (1942), p. 353.]

It will be noticed that in this firm conditions of labour seem to be good. The complaint is that it functions too impersonally.

We must recognize that this impersonalism is a very logical consequence of large-scale industry as we know it to-day. Its very size tends to make relations between those engaged

in it impersonal. So does the fact that capital is usually provided by shareholders who are quite out of touch with their employees. So does the rapid tempo and strain on management which is characteristic of modern production. Furthermore, none but the smallest producers are in direct contact with the final consumers of the finished product ; the intervention of a series of middlemen is a further factor making for the loss of personal relations in our economic system. Even collective agreements between trade unions and employers' associations, necessary and useful as they are, foster the same tendency to impersonalism, by merging the individual in an economic class.

Another factor making for the same result is, paradoxically, the fact that in these days a great deal of intellectual effort is being devoted to the understanding and analysis of social and economic life. All serious thinking requires the use of abstract generalizations and classification, and this has its dangers when the subject thought about is human beings. We talk about "the workers," "the employing class," "the unemployed," classifying persons according to a single characteristic ; and we must be on our guard lest this make us forget the reality of the persons we include in these groups. Statistical methods lead in the same direction, and it is noteworthy that, in the letter I have quoted, the management's interest in statistics rather than in individuals is mentioned. Even the title of this paper refers to "industry and commerce," which are abstract generalizations, facilitating thought about many different firms and enterprises of great diversity in actual life.

Closely connected with this last factor is the tendency in certain quarters to maintain that social and economic life is ruled by great impersonal forces, in the grip of which human beings are but puppets. I need not point out how illogical it is to assume that such forces would be working for human welfare. It is sufficient to say that any such theory is in profound contradiction with Christianity.

In sum, then, it appears to me that the all-important task of Christians is to insist that industry and commerce must take into account in all their operations and their organization the transcendent value of the human personality of each and all engaged in them : indeed, of all men whose lives are affected by the economic system, at home and abroad. Psychologically and morally, men, women and children

must be treated as such, and not as mere units in the economic machine. It is not for Christianity to give instructions about the technical side of industry and commerce, beyond the rule that technical administration, industrial and commercial strategy and tactics, are but means by which Christ's purpose for mankind is to be forwarded; and that therefore this, and this alone, is the ultimate standard by which they are to be judged. In the concrete, it is not for Christianity to say what measures should be adopted to secure wage-justice under our present economic system, or whether a one, two or three shift arrangement of hours is advisable, or whether some particular industry (e.g., the railways) should be nationalized or not, and so on. That is for those to decide who have full knowledge of all the relevant circumstances. What we must insist on is that such decisions be guided by the Christian principles I have outlined.

To say that *Christianity* has not the function of prescribing the technique of industry and commerce is, of course, by no means to say that *Christians* have no concern with that subject. In fact the more Christian in outlook our employers, managers, employees, directors, trade union leaders and others engaged in industry, the greater is the likelihood that the technical arrangements of our economic system will conform to Christian standards. And just in proportion as it does so conform, shall we have the sort of system that will make for social and individual welfare. It has been truly said that democracy is living on its Christian capital. If that were not to be steadily renewed, if it became exhausted, I find it impossible to see that any standard for decent social life would be left to us. The great enemy of social peace and welfare is selfishness, and I am delighted to have the support of Mr. Victor Gollancz (in his recent book "Shall our Children live or die?") when I affirm that if selfishness is to be controlled it is necessary for us all to co-operate in preserving and developing the Christian tradition. Here the schools and universities have a vital part to play. The children and young people of to-day are those who, in a few short years, will have the fate of our nation in their hands. What their moral characters will then be, whether they will be selfish or self-sacrificing, materialist or truly Christian, depend in great measure on the way in which they are being trained to-day.

LEWIS WATT.

WAR-TIME JOURNEYING

I. OVER SEA AND MOUNTAIN

I WAS in Florence when the Germans invaded Holland, and left Paris just after the Germans had turned the Maginot line at Sedan, and I did not set foot again on the mainland of Europe until I landed at Lisbon on October 11th, 1941.

I was very sorry to leave England, but when the Clipper took off for Lisbon my regrets were tempered by the thrill of returning to the Latin South, and I was awake long before the dawn, searching the horizon for the first hint of land. Long after darkness had ebbed from the eastern sky night still reigned on the Atlantic. Thousands of feet below us the dark ocean showed through windows in the curtain of mist, on the surface of which a light sparkled intermittently, as if it were a fallen star checked on its downward flight by a net of clouds. And then the star revealed itself as the flashing beam of a lighthouse, the summit of which just pierced through the low mists above the sea. And what were those dark shapes to the east? Clouds? My heart leaped when the cloud-like shapes resolved themselves into mountains, real mountains. I had said good-bye to the Alps from the terrace of Berne, while the Panzers were breaking through at Sedan, and the next mountains which I saw were the Rockies from Denver. Beautiful in their way, but I missed the dead, the Roman, the Burgundian, and the Habsburg. For there are moments when the tramp of dead legions can still be heard on the roads which the Roman built, and the echoes of Roland's horn still linger in the gorge of Roncevalles. It was good to return to mountains which had their roots in the great centuries, mountains which had watched the Romans come and the Saracens retreat, mountains whose approaches are guarded by castles, and whose valleys are sanctified by shrines and watered by Virgilian rivers, *fluminaque subterlabentia muros*, the mirror of ancient walls.

The Clipper floated over toy castles, and made a perfect landing on the unruffled waters of the bay. Before the out-

break of the war I had been living in the enchanted garden of St. Remigio, above Pallanza, and as I stood outside the Customs shed, and watched the Tagus awakening to the glory of the southern day, Maggiore seemed a little nearer. There was the same backwash of shadow as the sun climbed, the same golden shimmer of hills surrendering to the insistent heat, the same phantom breeze, ruffling the windless corridors of the dawn, and fretting the placid water by miniature ripples, the same gleaming expanses of burnished silver varied by pools of translucent blue.

I left that afternoon for Madrid, which I had last seen from the Campo Santo during the Civil War. The Madrid to which I returned was a sorrowful city, darkened by the shadow of an unpredictable future, and I was grateful to Miss Aileen O'Brien, who provided a car in which we escaped for a few hours into the hills. We drove through the ruins of the University City, past villages scarred by the war, towards the long line of the Sierra in which stands the Escorial. The serene beauty of the October hills, crested with premature snow, recalled the glory of the autumn Alps. I remembered the Oberland, the parched greens of the deserted cow alps showing through the dust of autumn snows, the noble curtain of forests which sweeps down to the lakes, the flame of larches set against the sombre background of evergreens, the purple of deciduous foliage, mirrored and reversed in the ultramarine of Brienz, and the mellow golden light, at once tender and discriminating, magical in its union of atmosphere and clarity.

The car stopped near the Escorial and suddenly I heard a sound which evoked a surge of memories, the jangle of a cowbell. A bullock was passing slowly in the street. I shut my eyes and tried to convince myself that I was listening to the unconduted orchestras of Buss or Wengernalp. But the mountains which overlook the Escorial evoke memories very different from those which are associated with the Alps, for I had last seen them during the Civil War. The son of a friend of mine was in command of a company, defending an outpost near the crest of the range. He came down to see his father, and I remember the whine of a spent bullet, as they wandered off together, and the contrast between the desolation of war on the mountain tops and the spring flowers in the valley below.

"You can see the Escorial" said my friend, "from the top of the mountain where my son is fighting."

The Escorial is autochthonous, for it is built of granite from the neighbouring Sierra. It is as austere as the mountain matrix from which it was hewed, as sombre as the Spain in which it was born, and as stern as the King who built it for his tomb. Magnificent, and yet I found myself sighing for the towers of Thun or Chillon. I remembered Byron's prisoner, the "little lake which in my very face did smile," and the blue distances of Lake Lemman flecked by lateen sails; and I recalled a remark of my wife's on our return to Switzerland shortly before Mr. Chamberlain flew to Munich. We had been living at St. Remigio, and though the Italians were uninfected by the inspired Anglophobia of the Fascist Press, the shadow of cruel things to come obscured the Italian sunlight, and for the first time in my life I was glad to leave Italy. As the train swept out of the Simplon tunnel into unpretentious and uncantankerous Switzerland, my wife exclaimed, "Isn't it wonderful to be back again in this dear country, which God stroked?"

But if God stroked the mountains which look down on the Escorial, He stroked them the wrong way. The angry outcrops of spiky crags on their crests suggest, not shade for hill lovers, but cover for hill fighters, and their forests bristle like the fur on the arched back of a spitting cat. All of which may be nothing more than an example of what Ruskin calls the "pathetic fallacy," the fallacy of reading our own sentiments into inanimate nature. Certainly, in that mood of Alpine nostalgia, the stern Sierras seemed to symbolise the uncompromising fanaticism of Spain. All or nothing, *Todo o nada*, is the key to Spanish history, but the Swiss mosaic of races would have disintegrated long since, had not the Swiss mastered the technique of "splitting the difference," a technique in which their only rivals are the British. Switzerland did not escape the backwash of Reformation and Revolution, but these spiritual cyclones had spent their force before they reached Switzerland. Switzerland produced no Torquemada or Robespierre, and it is significant that the border town, Geneva, least Swiss of all Swiss towns, was the scene of Calvin's experiment in fanaticism. Even Swiss civil wars run true to type, for the Sonderbund war of 1848 caused fewer casualties than the months of so-called peace which preceded the outbreak of the Civil War in Spain.

Life is a choice of sacrifices, and great Art is the by-product not of tolerance but of uncritical faith. The age which

produced the Escorial is an age of fanatic faith, feudalism, noble art, cruelty and dirt. The age which is coming to an end is one of growing scepticism, of democracy, humanitarianism, artistic decadence and admirable hygiene. Unfortunately, as Cnossos proved, good plumbing will not save a civilisation.

Torquemada was a high price to pay for the Escorial, but Main Street, Zenith, suggests that there is no necessary connection between architectural and ethical progress. Creative races are like bees. Remove their sting and they die.

If our world was less cruel than Torquemada's, and if the conviction that no price is too high to pay for peace had given us peace, we could resign ourselves to the decadence of art, but this is not the case. The soft pain-dreading temper of sceptical humanism has prepared the way for a new fanaticism and for an age of totalitarian wars. The cruelty of past ages is returning, but not their artistic glories. Though creative genius is often cruel, cruelty is not creative. As indeed was effectively demonstrated by the pretentious vulgarity of the exhibition of models and photographs of Nazi architecture which I visited in Lisbon.

I said good-bye to Europe at the Azores, and to the last outpost of Great Britain when the Clipper rose from Bermuda. For hour after hour we flew over a sun-tinted pavement of fleecy iridescent clouds, which reminded me of the Alpine *Nebelmeer*, but the monotony of these inane and empty realms, *vacua et inania regna*, was unrelieved by the thrust of cloud-piercing peaks, rising like islands above the foam of Alpine mists. And below these clouds there was no beloved Thun or Brienz or Lucerne, nothing but the dark solitudes of the sundering Atlantic.

I sailed from New York shortly after the United States entered the war. Electric lights were dimmed and all portholes hermetically sealed at night, with the result that life was unendurable below decks once we reached the tropics. I slept on deck and watched the Pole Star dip below the horizon and the Southern Cross climb above the southern wave, and I knew that not only the Atlantic, but the Equator, separated me from all that I love. Christmas in the Caribbean seas was a grotesque parody of Christmas at Mürren. Midnight Mass was celebrated in an airless lounge with dimmed lights and sealed portholes. Priest and congregation dripped

with perspiration. I remembered the frosty stars of Alpine Christmastides, and the friends who will never see Mürren again.

I landed in Callao, the port for Lima, on January 1st. I could not but feel that something had gone wrong with the calendar, for the Peruvian January seemed as grotesque as Hitler's "New Order." I sighed for the song of powdery crystals as the ski dive into sheltered glades, and for snows flooded with the temperate light of an invigorating sun, very different from the molten globe whose relentless inquisition has liquidated every blade of heretical green on the coastal ranges of Peru.

It was not only the seasons which were reversed when I crossed the Equator. I moved forward into summer, and backward into the Colonial past. A new civilisation is being created in North America; an old culture is dying in Peru.

What is left of Viceregal Lima is a fragment of the old Spain, abandoned and forgotten, on the far Pacific coast. The ruling families, mainly Spanish or of Spanish ancestry, are outnumbered twenty or thirty to one by the sullen Mestizos. Half-breeds and Indians are dreaming of the day when they too can liquidate the white ascendancy.

The new civilisation which is coming to birth in North America has many aspects, of which the most striking is the high standard of life—the consequence of mass production. But it is not only in economics that revolutionary changes are taking place. American humanism has given us the new architecture of the sky-scraper, the new art of the Disney cartoon, the new humour of the disillusioned (Thurber and Peter Arno), new dances such as the Charleston, new music such as jazz, new songs such as Negro spirituals, and a new philosophy of drink, the cocktail for a quick kick replacing the leisurely habit of wine. Nowhere is this new civilisation more bitterly criticised and more enthusiastically imitated than in Lima. A Spanish priest who had settled in Peru favoured me with a pungent variant of a familiar theme. "An American friend of mine took me to see the Brooklyn bridge and was pained because I was not very enthusiastic. But I can shut my eyes and think of a bridge five times bigger than Brooklyn, but I cannot shut my eyes and think of a painting five times more beautiful than a masterpiece by Velasquez or Murillo. The Americans judge all things by physical standards." This is wildly false, but it is arguable

that the mediæval emphasis on *qualitas* has been replaced, in America as elsewhere, by a new emphasis on *quantitas*. Yet the very emphasis on size, which disedified the Spanish priest, is really the expression of a romantic craving for *qualitas*. New qualities emerge in the course of a quantitative increase. The Mississippi is not only a very big river; the Rockefeller building is not only a very big building. There is a new *qualitas* in the Mississippi and in the best skyscrapers which is absent from the smaller rivers and buildings of Europe.

To have raised the standard of living among the lower strata of society is the supreme achievement of this new civilisation of North America, a civilisation which, whether we like it or not, is the civilisation of the "brave new world" of to-morrow. This new way of life is as different from the dying culture of Europe as *The New Yorker* from *Punch*, as indeed the aristocrats of Lima realise only too clearly. It has an irresistible appeal to the under-privileged and is even making converts within the citadels of aristocratic conservatism, for the younger generation of the ruling classes enjoy American films, adopt American fashions, and read American papers such as *The New Yorker* and *Time*—"Time which antiquates antiquity and hath an art to make a dust of all things."¹ But the older generation dread the influence of America, the great Anarch, solvent of authority, the authority of the Church, the authority of tradition, the authority of the parent, the authority of the husband, and know nothing of the religious and cultural forces in the U.S.A. which are resisting the disintegrating influence of an industrial civilisation.

The conflict of cultures has left its mark on the outward appearance of Lima. The rising tide of progress has engulfed all save a few sad remnants of the gracious past. In Viceregal Lima it is the baroque Church or Colonial architecture which is out of place, lingering on like a nervous guest who has outstayed his welcome.

When the day's work is done I often wander into the Plaza des Armes, and loiter for a few twilight moments near the fountain while the westering sun lights up the façade of the Cathedral which Pizarro planned. My evening pilgrimage takes me to the bridge across the Rimac, near which stands a decaying palace modelled on the ducal Palace

¹ Sir Thomas Browne.

at Venice. Smoke-begrimed by the railway, which runs between palace and river, this forlorn parody stabs me with nostalgic regret for the airy miracle of white and pink which floats above the blue shimmer of the Adriatic. Strange that any man should have thought it possible to recapture that phantom loveliness, but the old nobleman of Lima, who was guilty of this audacity, must have loved Venice, and across the years I salute his congenial ghost.

The contrast between the palaces which overlook the Grand Canale and the Rimac is no greater than the contrast between the Alps and the scorched hills above Lima. There are places on the Peruvian coast where rain has not fallen since the first world war, and even Lima measures its droughts not in weeks but in months. San Cristobal, which dominates the view from the Rimac bridge, has a mummified appearance, and the smooth pock-marked rocks which break through the arid slopes of dusty earth are like the bones of a skeleton showing through the disintegrating shroud of an exhumed corpse. Bad mountains when they die go to Peru. San Cristobal should have been christened Dives, for it raises its parched lips to heaven vainly imploring the benediction of rain.

The Rimac river is like the cup of cold water for which Dives begged in vain. Its meandering journey to the sea is marked by a narrow strip of privileged earth, lush green grass beside the river bed, gay gardens near its banks.

The Rimac springs in the ice caves of the Andean peaks, and does not wholly lose the virtue of snow in its long, sad pilgrimage through parched and thirsty lands. It is not the Rhone nor the Reuss nor the Aare, but was conceived, as they were, in the womb of ice. It is of the same royal race of snow-begotten streams, and speaks to me in a language which I can understand.

I have only to shut out San Cristobal and to close my eyes for a few minutes to forget my surroundings. The tuneless shanties of the Rimac recall the half-forgotten melodies of distant and beloved rivers. The barriers of space dissolve, and I hear again the plain chant of the Lütischine floating up through the thin air to the open windows of our old home at Grindelwald. And the golden past is reborn, and I return home to face with renewed confidence the dark and difficult future.

LIMA.

January 12th, 1942.

II. ALPS AND ANDES

Even a brief visit to South America checks any tendency to generalise about South Americans. The difference, for instance, between Peru and Chile is as marked as between Portugal and Spain, or even between Spain and Italy.

Lima is still a capital of the Spanish culture, but Santiago is a cross section of Europe. There are homes in Lima which might have been transported brick for brick from Spain—patios which reminded me of Seville—and a gracious way of life which is part of the Spanish heritage. The upper classes are great travellers in times of peace. Their culture is cosmopolitan, but Spain is the spiritual home even of those who have lived for years in Italy, in France or in England. Their forefathers threw off the political yoke of Spain, but the cultural ties remain.

Modern Chile, on the other hand, owes less to the Spaniards than to the British, German and Italian settlers. A few names selected at random from the leading members of the Ski Club Chile is characteristic of the Chilean mosaic. Agustin Edwards is the descendant of an English naval surgeon, Arturo Podesta of an Italian, Mitrovich is the son of a Croatian, Miss Ganaan's mother was a Belgian, and Mrs. Pfenigger, the lady national champion of Chile, is of mixed German and Swiss ancestry. Edwards, the owner of the oldest newspaper in the Spanish language, the *Mercurio*, is the son of a popular and influential ambassador at the Court of St. James.

As a city Santiago is less attractive than Lima. It has been even more grievously damaged by earthquakes and vandalism, and the few old buildings which remain are of no great interest, but few cities have a nobler setting. It is far enough from the sea to escape the aridity caused by the Humbolt current, with the result that the valley of the Mapocho in which Santiago lies is relatively fertile, and the Andean giants, some twenty thousand feet in height, are a complete contrast to the coastal ranges which overlook Lima. The view from San Cristobal is Italian in character. The Mapocho plain has a softness of colouring which one has learned to associate with Lombardy, but it is a Lombardy without the lakes. And the snowy peaks faintly flushed at sunset have a touch of Monte Rosa as seen from the north

Italian plains. The foothills, some eight thousand feet in height, are less fertile than the Jura, but infinitely less arid than the hills which overlook Lima. Their sunburnt slopes speckled with sparse green shrubs are similar in tone and texture to the foothills which keep one company on the journey between Milan and Verona.

In 1647, two hundred years before fashion was prepared to concede that mountains were not repulsive objects, a Chilean-born Jesuit, Alonso Ovalle, described the view from Santiago in a passage which is interesting as an early tribute to mountain beauty. "Then when the sun is shining on that immensity of snow and on the steep slopes and white sides and ridges of those far spread mountains, it is a sight that even to us who were born there and are accustomed to it, is wonderful, and gives cause to render praise to the Maker who could create so much beauty."

Many a time have I climbed San Cristobal to watch the sun setting on Paloma and Altar, "the Dove" and "the Altar." What beautiful names! How much better than Mount Cook or Mount Evans!

Paloma is the only mountain on the American continent which inspires in me that quasi-personal affection which I feel for the Alps. The Andes command respect, but do not encourage intimacy, perhaps because their scale is too vast, and their majesty too overpowering. From their roots in Venezuela to the Straits of Magellan the Andes wind through more than five thousand miles. To grasp this scale, you must imagine a mountain range which begins at Snowdon, which straggles across Europe and Asia, attaining its greatest height somewhere near Ararat and which fades out in the Himalayas.

But comparisons such as this only dimly convey the immensity of the Andes; and it was not until I flew along the range, for rather more than half its length, that my imagination began to register its dimensions. We took off from Santiago shortly after the dawn and landed just after sunset. As the plane rose from Santiago, Paloma and Altar sank, and the immensities of Aconcagua climbed into the sky, dwarfing the lower ranges in spite of the fact that some of their minor peaks were four thousand feet higher than Mont Blanc. The green valley of the Mapocho disappeared all too soon, and for hour after hour we flew over the unforgiving desert, chequered spaces of dull ochre, smooth and

lifeless like painted enamel, feathered with a fringe of spidery green lines, the irrigation canals which coax the furtive trickles of grudging water from the mountains to the burning plains. We slept at Lima, which is rather less than two thousand miles from Santiago, about as far as from London to Istanbul, and took off at dawn next day. As we approached Ecuador we escaped from the dominion of the Humbolt current, and the arid deserts gave way to tropical jungles. But the unending Andes continued to unfold their inexhaustible panorama of glacier-capped volcanoes, Aconcagua, Misti, Copuna, Huancaran, Cotopaxi, Caramba, few of them under, most of them well above the twenty thousand feet mark. It was not until the third day of our flight that our plane dipped down over "a peak in Darien" to the foothills of Panama.

Size and scale, not variety, are the key to the incomparable grandeur of the Andes. The Alps within small compass display a far greater range of mountain form than the Andes in all their pride of territory. The individuality of the Oberland peaks is due to the intricate interplay and overfolding of limestone and granite. The rhythm of the granite ridge which soars from the Jungfraujoch to the Jungfrau summit, fluted by ice, indented by frost and softened by snow, is the more striking by contrast with the smooth monotony of the polished limestone cliffs which fall in vertical sweeps to the Lauterbrunnen Valley far below. And the foil of gothic aiguilles provides the perfect balance to the baroque dome of Mont Blanc.

There is some magnificent ice work in the Andes, but a lamentable dearth of enjoyable rock work, for the Andean rock is, in the main, so brittle that many ridges are absolutely unclimbable. The softness of the material does not lend itself to the finer effects of mountain sculpture. One wearies of the unending volcanoes, for one volcano is very like another, and even Puntagurdo, which strikes out a new line of volcanic architecture, does not deserve its name, "the Matterhorn of the Andes."

"The Matterhorn," said a patriotic Swiss, "is like a sound tooth; Puntagurdo like a decaying tooth."

Those who love Nature in proportion as Nature is uncontaminated by man, and who maintain that Switzerland has been irretrievably ruined by trippers will, of course, prefer the Andes to the Alps, and the Chilean to the Alpine lakes. The Lago Todos los Santos in the Chilean lakeland

is often compared to Lake Lucerne, but I can well believe that this comparison might be repudiated with equal indignation by Andean and by Alpine enthusiasts.

Lake Lucerne and the Emerald Lake, as the Lago Todos los Santos is sometimes called, have much in common, a cruciform ground plan, narrow inlets and winding bays with sudden and everchanging disclosures of snow peaks and wooded hills, but the resemblances between the two lakes must have been infinitely more striking in the prehistoric ages before man had tamed and domesticated the surroundings of Lucerne. Man is a comparatively late comer to the Emerald Lake, but in the Alps man has been co-operating for thousands of years with other geological agents in changing the face of Nature. He has carved from primeval forests a *Lebensraum* for the cow, and incidentally provided not only the cow with pasture but also the ski-er with open slopes. In the Chilean lakeland man has won only his first skirmishes against Nature. The mountain slopes, mirrored in the Emerald Lake, are choked and strangled by forests. Only a few scanty plots have been liberated from the tyranny of trees.

Fire is the man's chief weapon in his war against the Chilean forests, and fire does not confine itself strictly to the ground which it is proposed to clear. Thousands of leafless blackened trunks strike a macabre note which spoils the idyllic beauty of the lake.

To compare Lucerne and the Emerald Lake is to do justice to neither lake. The loveliest effects on the Emerald Lake are oriental rather than Alpine. I remember, for instance, a fascinating vignette, the glacier-capped and Fuji-esque volcano Osorno showing through a framework of coije trees, very similar to the trees which are so familiar a feature in Japanese prints.

The Swiss and Italian lakes owe their appeal to the marriage between the art of God and the art of man. How I missed the signature of Man in the savage forests of Todos los Santos ! How I longed for little villages nestling near the lake shore, for Gothic spires or Romanesque campanili, for friendly little paths climbing past weather-stained chalets to the green grazing alps, dotted with slow-moving-cattle. I am happiest where neither Man nor Nature is completely supreme. Chicago and the Sahara are impressive, but I do not want to live in Chicago or to cross the Sahara.

If Todos los Santos may be compared to Lucerne, Lake Llanquiheue has something of the spacious grandeur of Lake Leman. I liked it all the better because here man has won his first battles against the forest. The faint gold of distant wheat fields on the lower slopes of Osorno melted into the dark greens of the forest and provided that contrast for which one looked in vain on Todos los Santos. Teutonic farmhouses, set among fields of flax and barley and hemp, bear witness to the industry of the German settlers and recall the shores of Tyrolean and Bavarian lakes.

Chile, which extends from the tropics to the subantarctic, has three zones, the southern in which it is extremely rainy, the central in which the climate is not unlike that of Switzerland, and the northern desert where it hardly rains at all. The Humbolt current is responsible not only for the aridity of the coast but also for the low average temperature. The summer snowline at latitudes which correspond to Naples, sinks to about 5,000 feet, the height of Mürren, and glaciers flow into the sea at points no further from the equator than Birmingham. If the Humbolt current swept round the shores of Britain, the icebergs from the great Snowdon Glacier would break off on the shores of the Irish Sea.

The Humbolt current not only lowers the temperature, but also deflects rain from the western coast of South America between Central Chile and Ecuador. I shall never forget the first impact of the Peruvian coastal range near Trujillo. I had slept on deck, and awoke to see mountains in reverse, snow-covered lower slopes leading up to snow-free crests above. In that moment of drowsy awakening, I wondered whether crossing the equator not only reversed the seasons but also transposed the kingdoms of rain and frost. I rubbed my eyes and the snow mirage vanished, to be replaced by white sand deposited there during long aeons of unending drought.

We sailed at sunset. Sullen clouds, which never relent into healing rain, brooded over the dessicated rocks, rocks which ranged in colour from rust red to ochre. The great sweep of white sand on the lower slopes, in the dull light of a shadowed sun, looked like the old and tired snow of an Alpine summer. Suddenly the sun burst through the clouds. The white sand gleamed, and the middle slopes flared up into a vivid, imperial purple.

Of all ranges on the American continent, north and south, none is richer in historical and prehistorical associations than the Andes. The Chichlin museum near Trujillo contains fascinating work by the Chimus, who preceded the Incas, and who created an advanced civilisation long before the Homeric age in Greece. The nomad Indians of the Rocky Mountains enriched neither art nor architecture but the Chimu artists could stand comparison with all save the greatest of the Greeks. Greek sculpture is, for the most part, impersonal, but the Chimu artists had as keen a flair for personality as a Hollywood agent, and their work is probably, for that reason, of far greater value in reconstructing their civilisation than the idealised and impersonal stock types which are reproduced again and again in Greek sculpture.

Chimu, Inca and Spaniard. The gulf of time, which divides the ruins of Chan from the lovable absurdities of the Rococo Carmelite church at Trujillo, exceeds by many centuries that which separates Argos from the miniature cathedral at Athens. It is not wholly fanciful to suggest that the Andes, though far less rich in historical and human associations than the Alps, derive some spiritual enrichment from the successive layers of culture which have been deposited on the plains which they overshadow.

No student of modern architecture can rest content until he has seen the New York sky line, but he will find few new buildings of outstanding merit south of the equator. On the other hand South America has some charming examples of the older styles, which are unrepresented in the United States.

The puritan settlers in New England had broken with their own past; the founders of the new Spain like the founders of Virginia and Georgia were conservatives who carried with them to the new world the traditional loyalties which they had inherited in the old. The puritans left England because they were in revolt against the established religion and the political structure of their country. The Conquistadors were fanatic Catholics and devoted servants of his most Catholic Majesty the King of Spain. New England soon evolved her own colonial aristocracy, and consequently her own architectural style, but the puritans were concerned to create a *bourgeoise* democracy in which counting houses would take the place of castles, and chapels of cathedrals. The Conquistadors, on the other hand, were anxious to

emulate in the new world the architectural glories of the court of Spain and they proved their loyalty to the European culture of which they were the trustees by building stately palaces and baroque cathedrals.

The savage and pitiless splendour of the Andean range provided a perfect setting for the ruthless epic of the Spanish conquest. Pizarro started out with 188 men for the conquest of Peru. Swallowed up in the immensities of an unexplored continent he emerged again in the Inca capital, and an ancient empire and advanced civilisation disintegrated under the impact of his extravagant self-confidence. His was no systematic invasion but the most reckless of commando raids—a raid from which there was no possibility of return.

I flew from Lima to the city which Valdivia founded. He started from Cuzco in Peru, which is nearer to Santiago than Lima. My journey was completed between sunrise and sunset; his lasted for twelve months. Only a small remnant of those who had crossed the desert under his command, creeping round the roots of the mountains, hurrying from one scanty trickling stream to the next, lived to set foot in that "Valparaiso" in which Valdivia founded his city, but the destitute and starved adventurers who completed the march had lost nothing of their superb confidence, and yet another empire collapsed at the approach of these extraordinary men.

The Conquistadors were impelled forward in the unknown, by a complex of many motives, ambition, greed of gold and patriotism. Their unshaken certitude of success was derived from their fanatic faith in their mission, the conquest of a new world for Christ and his most Catholic Majesty of Spain. They were undisturbed by the inconsistency between the methods which they adopted and the teaching of Him whose kingdom they believed themselves to be advancing. Indeed they were unaware of any conflict between the creed they professed and the code which they practised. They were as pitiless as they were brave, as ruthless as they were devout, and it is perhaps not surprising that they should provoke little but distaste in the minds of those who lack not only their defects but also their heroic qualities. The more anaemic type of historian, who is equally disedified by their ferocity and by their faith, often seeks to explain away and belittle their extravagance of superhuman courage.

In all recorded history of war there is no record of an invasion

more impudent than Pizarro's conquest of a great empire with a handful of 188 adventurers. Mr. E. J. Payne, after a few sneers at these "vile and sordid adventurers," airily dismisses the problem of their success by one of the silliest sentences ever written by a learned man: "the facilities of marching which a century of well organised aboriginal rule had established from one end of the dominion to the other and in several places between the coast and the mountain made Pizarro's progress easy."¹

As if "facilities of marching" were accessible only to the invader, helped on his forward movement by roads reserved for one-way traffic.

The Conquistadors did not confine themselves to the coastal roads: some of their mountain campaigns were at least as striking as Suvoroff's Alpine campaign, but by common consent the most impressive mountain campaigns in history were those achieved under the generalship of Bolivar during the war of liberation against Spain.

AN AIRPORT IN NEWFOUNDLAND.

ARNOLD LUNN.

Good Friday to Easter Sunday, 1942.

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. i, p. 46.

"THE MONTH" FORWARDING SCHEME

It is with special gratitude that we wish to thank all those who have assisted the Forwarding Scheme during the past year. It has meant, we know very well, a real sacrifice. But never was a gift more appreciated—to judge from the letters we receive. We are asked continually for more and more copies; we should be most grateful for further subscriptions to enable us to send them.

To certain countries publications can be sent only directly from the publishers. The Manager of THE MONTH has permission to send them. Whence the added value now of a direct subscription in favour of a missionary.

Readers who are willing to forward their "Month" to a missionary or to provide an annual subscription (14s.) for one to be sent direct to the more distant outposts, are asked to communicate with The Hon. Secretary, "The Month" Forwarding Scheme, 114 Mount Street, Grosvenor Square, London, W.1. Readers *must* enclose a stamped addressed envelope, and all names and addresses, whether of missionaries applying for "The Month," or readers providing it, *should be printed in capitals.*

CHRISTIAN CO-OPERATION IN ENGLAND TO-DAY

THE question of co-operation with non-Catholics is one that is troubling many Catholics to-day. It has been discussed this way and that. Some will have nothing to do with it ; others perhaps are throwing themselves into it without reflection on the consequences. Some have been at pains to define what are the limits of justifiable co-operation ; others have been led to think that as co-operation was in fact already in existence, it showed that, after all, it did not matter so very much whether one was a Catholic or not. Without professing to cover the whole ground, it has been thought worth while, indeed, in a sense, necessary, to treat of some of the main issues at stake. It may be of help to some who are taking an active part in organising joint activity especially locally, or who are as yet hesitant about undertaking such work. The need is so urgent, that it is important that minds should be set at rest about the justification of this Christian co-operation.

To an outsider it may seem strange that we, as professing Christians, should find any difficulty in the question at all. The word *co-operation* suggests to him nothing but charity and goodwill ; to hesitate about acting accordingly would seem to reflect on our attachment to the Christian Gospel itself. The fact is that the word *co-operation* has amongst us, and especially among those of us who have been through our priestly training, a number of associations which from the first render it suspect. The problems of "co-operation" which we have had to study, or which we have taken to the confessional to be solved, have all been concerned with the limits to which we can go in co-operating with actions which we would not dream of doing ourselves, and which, but for the circumstances, we would not wish to countenance in any way. Generally speaking, co-operation suggests to our minds co-operation with the *sins* of others. Our prevalent attitude is to have nothing to do with them. But circumstances may arise which do not allow of so simple a solution. If a man refuses to do what his employer tells him, he may risk losing

his job and throwing his wife and children into destitution. The problem is whether what he is told to do is such that under *no* circumstances may he comply, or whether it is such that the situation justifies him in obeying, at least for the time being. The more one has given oneself to the study of such problems, the more likely is it that the word *co-operation* will have bad associations.

Still more so, will the phrase "co-operation with non-Catholics." For our moral books and the pastoral guidance we may have received, rightly take for granted that other Christians worship God and practise their religion in a way or under circumstances that are forbidden to Catholics; problems therefore arise as to the limits to which co-operation with them can go, e.g., when social or family reasons seem to require their presence at a funeral. Such matters are fully discussed by the moral theologians, and need to be so discussed; but naturally, by sheer association of ideas, the phrase "co-operation with non-Catholics" will have attached to it the sense of something that is dangerous and only to be tolerated, as it were, under pressure—not of something that breathes goodwill and Christian charity. The fact that the problems discussed cover only a comparatively limited field tends to be overlooked, and what is true enough there, comes to be applied more or less universally.

That this is due only to a certain inertia of the mind seems clear in view of what is going on every day without ever raising any problem at all. Our Catholic M.P.'s or municipal Councillors or the like are prepared to discuss politics, social welfare, prison reform, education and what-not with men who are not only non-Catholic, but non-Christian—with Jews, and atheists too: and the more strident part of the Catholic Press is constantly calling them to task if they do not take all the part they can in matters that affect the national or municipal good. Indeed any Catholic who finds himself in the position to do so will feel it his duty to take his proper share in determining policy, in introducing amendments or in carrying out the functions of the administration or the judicature. Why is all this taken for granted? Where is the difference between this and the work contemplated, for instance, by the Sword of the Spirit? The main difference seems to be that the blessed word "co-operation" is not ordinarily mentioned in this connection. The *idea* has necessarily been present in individual issues; for instance,

Catholics felt that it would have been unseemly to take part in the Prayer Book Measures of 1928 and 1929, and their attitude towards various Bills before Parliament is often determined by putting to themselves the question: "How far can I, as a Catholic, co-operate with this Measure which seems to endanger such and such a right of the Church or such and such moral principle?" But the fact that those with whom they are thrown are not Catholics, that some of them may be utter pagans, has never of itself raised the question: "Can I co-operate with them?"

The reason is not far to seek. The healthy life of the nation depends to a large extent on the legislation and the administration that prevails in it. The life of the nation must go on, and it will be more or less healthy in proportion to the rectitude and good sense of those with whom rest the vital decisions or their execution. To help to infuse good ideas and sound principles into them cannot but be praiseworthy, even though the decisions actually taken may not always be the best possible. At least they are prevented from being any worse. It is not the religious or irreligious character of the participants that determines whether we should take part or no, but the promotion of the common good. That is of paramount importance, and so long as there exists freedom of speech and of vote—so that a man by joining a party is not obliged to endorse every motion put forward by the party—so long will a Catholic have full freedom, indeed at times the duty, to co-operate even with atheists at the council table. As this presents no real problem, the question of "co-operation" from the Catholic point of view does not arise. *Solvitur ambulando.*

We should not then be led astray by the mere association of ideas. The stock problems associated with "co-operation with non-Catholics" deal only with what affects their worship or the spreading of their doctrines, in other words with the religious field. They must not lead us into thinking that there is a general problem of such co-operation which would arise in every field. As for the Sword of the Spirit, not only are questions of worship, religious belief or Church organization explicitly placed outside the scope of the joint action contemplated, but the purpose of the whole movement is to take such action as may ward off from our people the dangers of a way of life threatening to become entirely irreligious. There may be other problems, other difficulties which will

have to be met as they arise, but it would seem that at least there is no *question préalable* about the lawfulness of co-operation with non-Catholics in general. Indeed the first reaction to the suggestion that we should co-operate in such a good cause, should be one not of apprehension and misgiving, but of thankfulness to God for such an opportunity, and of goodwill towards our new allies.

It is important to stress that the co-operation contemplated is such as will not involve "raising ultimate questions of Church order and doctrine which divide us," as the Joint Statement explicitly affirms. If this is borne in mind, two serious difficulties will be overcome. The first is that already dealt with: the reluctance to join hands with those who are religiously divided from us—and we must not imagine that the reluctance is all on our side; the second is one that is very likely to occur especially among the weaker brethren, viz., that as Catholics are co-operating with others on equal terms, the Church is after all only one amongst many, and that a Catholic might, on occasion, have good reasons for changing his religion. It will be necessary to keep before people's minds that the Church has not changed her nature as "the one ark of salvation for all" because co-operation with non-Catholics in the social and international field has been approved of by the hierarchy, and one of the best ways of doing so is to point out the terms on which both sides have agreed to work together. Catholics will work as Catholics, Anglicans as Anglicans and Free Churchmen as Free Churchmen. There is no question of "Reunion" in the religious sense.

On the other hand, granted the limitations indicated, it seems reasonable to ask whether, after all, it is not *religious* motives that have prompted so many to initiate or to welcome this new move? Does not belief in God, does not faith in Christ and loyalty to his teaching—characteristics which we all share—urge us to combine against the introduction or rather the extension of a godless, worldly view of man and of his life on earth? We have a striking example of this in the case of Holland, where Calvinists and Catholics united to fight for their religious schools as against the prevailing secularist ideas. Tacit understanding between the two parties during some years gave place to an offensive and defensive partnership with the result that after gaining one point of their programme after another, they secured in 1920

for their schools a position of complete liberty and equality with the State schools. It took some forty years to accomplish, but before the war Catholic education in Holland was better treated, perhaps, than anywhere else in the world. Such a happy result could not have been achieved by the Catholics alone, and the alliance was explicitly based on common belief in God and common loyalty to Christ. We all know how vigorous is the life of the Church in Holland; it has not suffered by what was once called this "monstrous alliance"; on the contrary it has been enabled to develop mightily at home and abroad, fostering social reforms as well as Foreign Missions, and quite recently we have had fresh evidence of their stand against their Nazi oppressors, in which the Hierarchy have found at their side the General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church.

With this example before us, we may well ask whether, even if doctrinal and ecclesiastical questions are excluded from the scope of our co-operation, it is not true that we can and should co-operate *as Christians*. It is often said that, of course, we can co-operate on the basis of the natural law, but that our views of Christianity are so different that, once we leave generalities, agreement will be impossible, as involving just those doctrinal matters which are excluded. It is important to clarify our ideas on this question. To begin with, the Natural Law is a concept which is mostly unfamiliar among non-Catholics. Where we should say "observing the natural law," they as likely as not would say "behaving like a Christian." Nor would those who wish to co-operate with us mean by the phrase simply behaving decently, in a kindly way, or whatever else the word *Christian* is so often watered down to, but definitely behaving as men who earnestly followed Christ would behave. We might be inclined to retort that in these cases there is no need to be a Christian in order to appreciate or to adopt such conduct; that man, simply as man, can see its rightness. But, if we reflect, we shall be forced to admit that after all that is the way a Christian should act, since Christianity does not supersede but includes the natural law. What is more, the Natural Law stands a poor chance of being regularly observed apart from Christianity; the exceptions are exceptions, and therefore in working together for social and international reforms along sound lines we can truly be said to be promoting Christian principles and co-operating *as Christians*. The

observance of the Ten Commandments is a primary interest to us as Christians; it is primarily as Christians that we learnt them; given in the Old Law, Christ confirmed them in the New, and no one doubts that, by and large, their *revelation* was necessary.

If then most of the objects that we are aiming at would be classed by us under the heading of the Natural Law, it is the fact that we are Christians which makes us attach so much importance to them. It is the purely secularist view of life which must be opposed, and not only that which is anti-God and enforces its ideas by Gestapo or Ogpu, but that more insidious view which while professing to respect the dignity and the rights of the individual, actually offers the majority of men nothing more than an increase of comfort and pleasures as the end of all their efforts. The true dignity of man cannot be appreciated save in view of his relations to God and of his eternal destiny, and while the "Good Pagan" may succeed in removing much that is evil and introduce much that is good, he is only on the fringe of things, and will never provide *happiness* even in this world, let alone the next.

This then is the first and the most important thing that we have in common—our belief in God the Creator, to whom we are all responsible for all we do. He cannot simply be left in His heaven while we set all right in the world. It is His world: He made it; He made us; if we have a conscience, if we recognise that we should do what is right and if "something" forbids us to do what we know to be wrong, it is because we are responsible to God for our actions. Further, He made us what we are—He did not make us angels, but men; and therefore all that necessarily goes with that fact is also His ordinance, first the family and secondly that wider family (as it was intended to be) the State. The respective rights and duties of the individual, the family and the State, cannot be rightly determined if the relation of each man to God is left out of account, since that relation affects his actions both as an individual, as a person in the family, and as a responsible member in the body politic. Whatever be the results of his actions in his immediate *entourage*, they will have eternal results for him. *That* is his great dignity, that is why his personality calls for respect, and that is why we, as Christians, cannot tolerate that reconstruction should take account only of material improvements, necessary as

these may be. Indeed material improvements apart from a Christian conception of life will not be lasting; they will only bring in their train more misery and more wars as did the "progress" of the last hundred years.

It is not the purpose here to develop the full consequences of this recognition of God as our Creator and Lord of all things; what has been said will suffice to show how far our agreement even on so "elementary" a point will take us. Our belief in Christ takes us still further, and by this is meant not the full content of our Catholic belief, which it would be absurd to pretend was common ground between all Christians in this country, nor even perhaps the recognition of His divinity, but that conception of Christ which is expressed by the term *legatus divinus* in our theological textbooks. Whatever else needs to be added to the idea, it is common ground among all convinced Christians that He has brought to us a message divine in origin, and that therefore His authority is unique and of permanent relevance. His example, His teaching, His revelation of God as a just but loving Father are not just fireside stories, but facts which challenge our innermost conscience and which we neglect at our peril. Here once more we cannot develop all that is implicit in such a belief; even conceived in this attenuated form, our common loyalty to Christ will give us abundant guidance both in determining the common measures to be adopted and above all in infusing a new spirit into the way in which they are put into execution. He teaches us brotherhood, forbearance, charity—but not to the exclusion of *justice* for all its unpleasant implications, since Christ revealed a *Father* in Heaven and not "a grandfather in heaven—a senile benevolence who, as they say, 'liked to see the young people enjoying themselves' and whose plan for the universe was simply that it might be truly said at the end of each day, 'a good time was had by all'."¹ Justice and charity—to these we must add the conviction that happiness is not won by self-seeking, whether in private life, or in family life, or in those larger relationships which make up business life and social and political life in its widest sense. Lastly a belief in Providence which alone can tide us over those unavoidable periods when our own personal world seems to be all awry if not collapsing, and which alone can keep hope and confidence alive when disaster or death is threatening.

¹ C. S. Lewis, "The Problem of Pain," p. 28.

A third common treasure that we all share is the Bible. Not that we all understand all of it in the same way, but we at least all regard it as a sacred book which contains the history that prepared the coming of Christ, the accounts of His life and teaching, and the writings of some of His first disciples. Cut out the Bible and Christianity would cease to be. One might well ask whether any coalition of hitherto opposed parties has ever had at its disposal such common ground as is provided by the reverence which all convinced Christians pay to the Book *par excellence*. It is, no doubt—partly for that very reason—the source of many of our differences, but appeal to it will be natural to all those co-operating, and may often provide decisive guidance or justification in the adoption of important measures in the restricted field of their common action.

These three headings: God, Christ, the Bible, indicate that there really does exist a common Christian basis of co-operation and that, *as far as it goes*, it is a clearly defined basis. The presence of Christians in our midst who would at least *doubt* about part or all of it must not lead us astray. The appeal of the Joint Statement is addressed to all “informed and convinced Christians all over the country,” and no informed and *convinced* Christian would call in question any part of the common basis here outlined. And anything less than a clearly defined basis is no basis at all. One cannot base common action on uncertainties or on ambiguities; common ground in view of practical activity must be *solid* ground—something you can plant your feet on firmly, something you can defend against attack, something for which you are prepared to make sacrifices. Common ground can consist only of certainties which all alike share, and it is only such certainties which have been looked for here.¹ Mutual discussion and better understanding of each other's positions may well lead to additions being possible to the common ground; possibly the doubters too will find that their doubts were based on an ideology which the stern facts of life have shown to be of straw.

For ourselves, this selection of points and the restricted

¹ For this reason there is no room here for the *Church*. Though all speak of “the Church,” there is nothing in the various meanings attached to the word that is really common to all. The most that can be said is that we are all agreed that the Church played an important part in the life of the early Christians as revealed in the New Testament and that its function in the world to-day is vital. But ask us what the Church is, and we all answer differently. There is no common basis here.

sense in which they are understood must not be taken to imply that all the rest is indifferent ; that we can sink our differences, that they do not matter. Such a selection depends on no theological principle ; it can be determined only by the *de facto* position of religious thought at the moment. But as far as it goes, it does give us what we all hold, and hold in the same sense. Of course it makes a difference whether we believe Our Lord is God or not. *We* do so ; so do many, if not most, of our friends. But not all. The point is, however, that at least we are all convinced that He has made known to us God's mind, that His teaching and example are a message from God ; and here we have something which already makes all the difference when we are facing those who take a purely worldly view of things.

The fact is that there is in the air a strong current which, for all its well-meaning intention to sweep away all kinds of abuses and to better the general environment of the citizens of this country, is in fact creating a machinery which is likely to squeeze out of existence that very freedom of initiative and self-determination which it was designed to foster. We Catholics need not only to unite among ourselves, but also to rally together all men of good will who realize the danger, in order to replace such proposals by better ones, and meantime to get the country to realize that more moderate measures, together with the re-diffusion of a more Christian spirit, will in the long run secure greater happiness for our people, and enable each and everyone to order his own life, within the framework of the laws of the State, according to those principles of conscience which through our endeavours and those of the other Christians with whom we co-operate, he will recognise to be already written in his heart.

MAURICE BÉVENOT.

EDITORIAL NOTE

All contributions submitted to the Editor must be typed and be accompanied by a sufficiently large stamped addressed envelope—stamps (or Post Office coupons from abroad) alone will not suffice. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research. They should not ordinarily exceed 3,000 words, and must be intended for exclusive publication in the "Month," if accepted.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to The Editor of "The Month," 114 Mount Street, London, W.1, and not to the Publishers : Business Communications to The Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15, who also receives subscriptions (14s. per annum post free).

ROME AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION IN ENGLAND¹

IN his latest work Fr. Hughes undertakes to describe the measures which the Church adopted to counter the Reformation in England, to say what Catholics did in reply to militant anti-catholicism, in what spirit these Catholics acted, who were the men that led them and how their endeavours fared.

After a concise survey of the religious changes effected in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, he discusses the Marian Reaction; the successful efforts of Spain to delay the coming of Cardinal Pole to England until the marriage of Mary to Philip had been settled, the reconciliation with Rome and the measures adopted by Pole for the reform of the Church.

The author shrewdly remarks "that it was not enthusiasm for heresy that really mattered in Mary's reign and in the first critical years of Elizabeth; but the reluctance of the laity emancipated from the control of clerics, and more recently still, triumphant over the clerics, to submit to any externally imposed reversal of this process; a laity, moreover, enriched with wealth taken from the clerics."² As the Catholic exiles pointed out more than once, the final settlement of the religious question under Elizabeth was essentially the work of laymen.³

The author's portrait of the gentle and scholarly character of Pole is finely drawn and very attractive, but he does not minimise his political inefficiency or rather his withdrawal from politics. It is questionable, indeed, whether the choice of Pole by Rome was a happy one. Possibly a more forthright character, one more astute and politically-minded, would have handled an extremely difficult situation more efficiently. It is hard to say, for the governing factor of Pole's failure appears to have been the short space of time

¹ "Rome and The Counter-Reformation in England." By Rev. Philip Hughes. London: Burns Oates. Pp. viii, 466. Price: 18 s.n. 1942.

² P. 117.

³ Cf. L. Hicks, S.J., Catholic Exiles and the Elizabethan Religious Settlement, *American Catholic Historical Review*, July, 1936, pp. 131-137, where the point is treated at length.

allotted by Providence to carry out his work. In any case before judgment can be passed, an adequate life of Pole is needed, and this, as the author notes, is yet to be written. An essential preliminary to such a life is a new edition of his letters, for the collection, edited by Quirini in 1755, is by no means complete. Fr. Hughes, though inclined to exaggerate the effect of the repressive measures against heretics in Mary's reign, accepts Miss Garrett's¹ conclusion that the flight of Protestants to the Continent was not caused by these. Rather was it an organised movement, planned and in part executed, before these measures were put into force, in view of the religious revolution the leaders hoped to effect on their return.

In his treatment of Elizabeth's reign, the author traces the two methods adopted to bring about the restoration of the Faith in England; the political or the use of temporal power, and the purely spiritual. His condemnation of the excommunication of the queen, is more severe than the balanced judgment of Fr. Pollen, and he entirely overlooks its good effects. The Jesuit historian by no means minimised the harm done by it, but added: "Against this must be set the inestimable advantage of making it evident to all the world that Elizabeth and her followers were cut off from the Catholic Church, that to accept and submit to her was to reject that Church. The Bull made clear the iniquity of attending Protestant churches at her command, which nothing had hitherto been able to bring home to the Tudor Catholics, with their miserable proclivity to give up religious liberty at the sovereign's whim. Now at last those who refused to attend grew into a body and won a special name, that of Recusants."² It is, moreover, but a half-truth to state, as does Fr. Hughes, that "never since 1570 has any Pope excommunicated any sovereign in such a way as to declare the subjects free from allegiance." In 1585 Henry of Navarre, heir to the throne of France, was excommunicated with all the consequences concerning the succession that it entailed; and it was only after prolonged and mature deliberation, that he was absolved from it by the Pope, two years after his return to the Faith. Nor did a later Pope,

¹ Cf. "The Marian Exiles, 1553-1559." By Christina Hallowell Garrett, M.A., Cambridge, 1938. A splendid piece of historical research. The "full narrative" promised in the preface is eagerly awaited.

² "The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth." J. H. Pollen, S.J., p. 156.

Paul V, in 1606, hesitate to place Venice, still a power in the world, under an interdict.

The political activity of Allen and Persons, Fr. Hughes discusses with rare discernment. His explanation of their point of view is undoubtedly the correct one, and much support for it is to be found in their extant writings. He is not so happy in his account of the actual course of their activity from the year 1582. Acquaintance with the work of Kretzschmar,¹ and the documents published by him would have improved this section of the book. To call Lennox a Catholic is certainly inaccurate, and Persons's journey in 1583, was to Rome, and not, as the author states, to Spain. In his over-emphasis on the Armada, Fr. Hughes views it in the light of after-history. That it heralded the decline of Spain, subsequent events made clear, but to those who lived at the time, that was by no means apparent. The decline, in any case, was gradual, and for years after the Armada, Spain remained a great power. It was not the impotence of the Spanish crown, but its might, that made the Papal policy, after the conversion of Henry IV, lean more to the court of France. Till then, with France hopelessly weakened by internal strife, there had been no Catholic power on which the Papacy could rely as a counterpoise to the preponderating influence of Spain. The statement, too, that the plans of Pope Sixtus V were broadcast to the world in the famous Declaration,—it was Allen's work—is inaccurate; for though printed in view of a landing by the Spaniards in England, it was never published. The English Government only obtained a copy by underhand means, and, it may be added, used it with abominable deceit and chicanery in the trial of Bd. Philip Arundel.²

In any discussion of papal policy towards Elizabeth, the question of assassination plots is bound to occur; for it is generally recognised now that some countenance was given to such plots by the Roman Curia. Following the line of argument already laid down by Knox,³ Fr. Hughes has some excellent pages in explanation of the papal point of view. He might have added that the initiative of such plots never came from the Pope and that Elizabeth's life was never really in danger.

¹ "Die Invasionsprojekte der Katholischen Mächte gegen England zur Zeit Elisabeths," Leipzig, 1892.

² Cf. The Ven. Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel. C.R.S., xxi, pp. 166 ff.

³ "Letters and Memorials of William, Cardinal Allen," pp. xxiv-xxix.

It is well known that the divisions or factions that always existed among the Catholic exiles came more and more to a head after the Armada. On this topic Fr. Hughes's pages are somewhat superficial. It is an over-simplification to speak of the Spanish and anti-Spanish or Scottish party—even though the terms are found in contemporary documents. Difference in political outlook was far from being the only cause of the divisions: personal considerations, particularly the delay in payment of the Spanish pensions, played no inconsiderable part in them. There was a strong personal element, too, in the opposition to Allen himself. Little account, indeed, is made of it in these pages, but it was sufficiently strong to provoke a complaint from Allen. The party of which Morgan was the conspiring head, opposed his being made Cardinal, sent an envoy later to traduce him to the King of Spain and endeavoured to have Owen Lewis raised to the purple as a counterweight to Allen's influence.

But whatever anti-Spanish feeling existed among a certain section of the exiles, it is uncritical to transfer that feeling to the Catholics at home, unless evidence is adduced for it. In default of evidence, such a statement as "there is little doubt that they (the Catholics in England) were, and remained throughout the reign, as sturdily anti-Spanish as their Protestant neighbours"¹ must be regarded as gratuitous. In point of fact, it is contradicted by letters from England of May and June, 1597. These not only declare that "the principal and most prudent Catholics in England and all to whom the matter has been communicated, have thought the declaring of the Infanta heir to the English throne, an excellent remedy for doing away with all differences," but they also set down certain conditions, particularly should she after marriage, die without children.² It is further contradicted by the long letter of April, 1599, to the Attorney General, written by William Watson,³ no willing witness to the strength of pro-Spanish feeling among the Catholics, as well as by that of the Bishop of London to

¹ P. 227.

² La respuesta venida da Inglaterra por diversas cartas de Maio y Junio deste año 1597 sobre la proposicion de la Sa Infanta. Bibl. Vat. Lat. 6227, f.42. The document, among Mgr. Peña's papers is endorsed "Cerca la proposicion de la Sa Infanta de Spaña para aquella corona de Inglaterra." There is another contemporary copy, presumably that sent by the Spanish Ambassador at Rome, the Duke of Sessa, to the King of Spain, in the Simancas Archives. Sec de Estado, Leg. E. 969.

³ "The Archpriest Controversy." Edited by T. G. Law. Camden Society, 1896. Vol. I, pp. 210 ff, particularly pp. 213, 215, 217, 221, 223.

Cecil, the 3rd of June, 1601.¹ Nor must it be overlooked that only a year before the death of Elizabeth, an envoy was sent to Spain by several leading Catholics to discover whether that country would assist in placing a Catholic successor on the throne.² It is true that the Appellant priests showed anti-Spanish sentiments, but they cannot be regarded as representing the Catholics of England. Not merely did they form but a very small minority of the clergy, but, as is clear from their own books, the laity were opposed to them. And even the Appellants make no mention of the political issue in their first four books; that was only brought forward later, and was, probably, not uninfluenced by their close association with the English Government and by their policy of seeking the aid of France in their appeal to Rome.

As regards the Book of Succession, Fr. Hughes will find it difficult to find any solid evidence, and he gives none, for the statement that an act of Parliament made it treasonable to possess a copy. He will look in vain through the Statute Book for such an act. Nor, through lack of acquaintance with the pertinent documents, does he realise that though undoubtedly the book displeased those who favoured the claims of the King of Scotland, the so-called sensation caused by it, particularly on the continent, was to a great extent deliberately and artificially engineered by William Gifford.³ By it he hoped to strike a blow for his candidate for the purple, Owen Lewis, by ruining the chances of Persons being made a Cardinal, which not a few were advocating at that time. He was assured by Malvasia, the Pope's agent in Flanders, whom Gifford, according to his own statement had "at his beck," that in consequence of the book, so long as the Pope lived, Persons "would never rise."⁴ And one

¹ B. M. Add. 6177, p. 163.

² Cf. J. H. Pollen, S.J., *The Accession of King James I. The Month, June, 1903*, p. 9.

³ Gifford's letter to Malvasia, with a summary of the book, which was sent on to Cardinal Aldobrandino, is in Arch. Vat. Borghese II, 448 ff, 436-441, cf. Malvasia to Aldobrandino, 27th June, 1595; *Ibid.* Nunz. di Fiandra 8, p. 319: Mgr. Peña's "Relation" Bibl. Vat. Lat. 6227, f. 8. Cf. *Ibid.* p. 75. "Hebbe Egli [Gifford] ancora la mano nel trattato di far robbare dal stampatore in Anversa l'original copia del libro della successione, per farne querela contra, et in Venetia et in Fiorenza et in Roma, com'anco in Francia, Inghilterra et Scotia": cf. also Persons to Idiaquez, 1st May, 1597, Stonyhurst, Anglia II No. 26.

⁴ Gifford to Throgmorton, 15th June, 1595. R. O. Dom. Eliz. Vol. CCLII No. 66, 1. Cf. also the Nuncio in Spain to Aldobrandino, 30th December, 1596. Arch. Vat. Nunz di Spagna, 46, f. 788, and Borghese iv 209. B. f. 199. Malvasia is often referred to as Nuncio, but incorrectly. Brussels only became a nunciature in 1596, when Mgr. Frangipani was appointed to represent the Pope in that

of the first things Persons did in 1597, on reaching Rome from Spain, was to remove the false impression of the book, created by Gifford and Malvasia in the papal curia.¹ Nor can Persons be said to be the sole author of the work. He categorically denied it when the charge was made by Dr. Pierce,² and there is solid evidence, unknown to Tierney, that Allen, Verstegan, Englefield and others had all some hand in it.³ Must it be added that they did not help in its composition, merely for private use? It is uncritical to father the whole responsibility either for its composition or for its publication on Persons.

So much for the political method, the reliance on Spanish force to resist the militant anti-Catholicism in England. Of the spiritual antidote Fr. Hughes writes less extensively. He has an excellent chapter on our martyrs, the glory of the English Church, and, indeed, in any true scale of values, of England itself; and he rightly emphasises the predominant number of the secular clergy who gave this supreme testimony of their Faith. But his section on the seminaries, which after all were the training ground of these heroes, is quite inadequate. The account of Douay is all too brief and little if anything, is said of the English College, Rome and of the other seminaries and colleges in Spain and Flanders. The apostolate of the press, though it was a work of the first importance, is dismissed with a bare mention. Certainly, from these pages, no one would gather any idea of its extent or quality. There is a need long felt, of a full account of this Catholic literature. Such a study, so far as it concerns the English books, would have the additional advantage of

court. The Nuncio in Spain points out to the Pope the evil effects Malvasia's actions may have on the relations of Pope and Nuncio with the King of Spain.

¹ Cf. Mgr. Peña's minutes of his conferences with Persons, 2 and 17th April, 1597, and Persons's account of his first audience with the Pope. Bibl. Vat. Lat. 6227 ff 161, 162. Cf. also Persons to Idiaquez 1st May, 1597. There are, in point of fact, only one or two errors in Gifford's summary of the book, but the impression created is undoubtedly a false one, as he gives no idea of Persons's arguing pro and con for the various candidates to the throne. The opinion of the Nuncio in Spain, who had read the book more than once, is very different from that of Gifford. Cf. The preceding note. Mgr. Peña notes the Pope's approval of the book after Persons had explained its purpose. Bibl. Vat. Lat. 6227, f. 12.

² Bibl. Vat. Lat. 6227, f. 202 and West. Arch VI. Nos. 20 and 21.

³ Englefield bears this out in his written opinion of the book, in which he answers objections. *Ibid.* f. 154 ff. and West. Arch. VI., No. 123. It appears that Persons took this paper with him to Rome in 1597. It is also borne out by Allen's opinion of the book, English College, Valladolid, Leg. 4, Nos. 1, 2, 3. This long paper was written in 1596, after his death, by an intimate of the Cardinal. Fr. Grene, S.J., thought the author was the Cardinal's secretary, Arch., S.J., Rom. Anglia, 37, f. 203. Cf. also Persons to Crichton, 2nd November, 1596. Coll., P. 318.

making a solid contribution to the history of English prose ; for some of the finest writers of the time are to be found among the Catholic exiles.

Inadequate though the account be of the spiritual counter-attack, there is no doubt to which of the two methods of resisting the Protestant revolution, Fr. Hughes's sympathy inclines. He is all for the spiritual, and in his heart condemns the political method, and Rome, too, for adopting it. In fact his sympathy leads him to overstate his case. That all these political "schemes and projects were vowed to futility from their first inception" is rather a sweeping assertion. It may be true : it is by no means certain. Most assuredly they did not appear so to contemporaries, whether Catholic or Protestant. That they failed in fact, cannot be denied ; but it is easy to be wise after the event, and not a little uncritical to condemn those who espoused them in the light of after-history. Nor must it be forgotten that the Faith was saved in France by the political method, and indeed by the intervention of Spain at two critical periods. The same overstatement is revealed in the author's picture of what might have been achieved by purely spiritual weapons. "To introduce" he writes, "into every town and county of England men of utterly selfless lives, dedicated wholly to the service of God, trained in charity, instructed in the Faith, and to maintain a constant supply of such unworldly apostles, might easily, even after twenty years of Protestant ascendancy, have turned the scales against 1559 ; for Anglicanism was by no means, as yet, out of the critical stage and certain to survive." Here the author is leaving the solid ground of history and entering the realm of phantasy. Saints, and such men as he postulates above would be saints, are not generally as plentiful as gooseberries. True it is that one cannot put limits to the grace of God, but historically speaking, the facts show that there never was any prospect of thus winning the country back to the Faith, even in the more favourable days of Charles I, still less after twenty years of Elizabethan rule amid the severities of persecution. Rome, indeed, valued the spiritual weapon, quite as much as any of her critics, but she was a realist ; and if later under Charles I, as the author remarks, she looked primarily to the conversion of the reigning sovereign—a far from accurate statement—she was aiming thereby at securing toleration for Catholics in England, that so

the spiritual weapon might be employed to the fullest advantage.

For the third and last section of the book, Fr. Hughes offers an apology: the outbreak of the war caught him with his study of the subject still incomplete and prevented him from making good the defect. One cannot but feel sympathy with the author on that account, yet at the same time the wisdom of his decision to go forward with the publication of the work may be called in question; for after the brave words of the preface and some excellent earlier chapters, this section, easily the weakest of the book, comes as an anti-climax and detracts considerably from the value of the work as a whole. Certainly in his treatment of the appointment of an Archpriest and of the controversies that arose from it, his lack of acquaintance with the essential documents is all too much in evidence; even the printed sources, edited by Law,¹ have not been consulted. The section needs really a more detailed criticism than there is space for in this review, but one or two points at least may be indicated. Thus, little or no connection is shown between the anti-Jesuit movement in Flanders, England and Rome² in the years 1595 to 1597, and the appointment of a superior over the secular clergy of England; though the former had considerable influence in the decision to take such a step. Statements, too, are made without any evidence being adduced for them, such as, that Persons was responsible for the form of government³ chosen. The Jesuit, indeed, it is

¹ "The Archpriest Controversy," 2 vols. Camden Society, 1896, 1898.

² The author seems unaware that during the troubles, 1595-1597, the Jesuits asked the Pope to be relieved of the charge of the English College. Arch. Vat. Borghese II, 448 ab. ff 416-417, is a document giving the reasons why the Jesuits think they should relinquish the College. It is addressed Al. C. Aldobrandino p. Smo Nro Clemente, Papa, viii. and is endorsed Smo. Do. Nro per la Compagnia di Gesu. A counter-petition, undated and not apparently by Jesuits, is also in the same archives. *Ibid.* f. 218.

³ Our author is simply repeating the wild surmise of the Appellants, who could not know the proceedings in Rome. Dr. Bavant, not a Jesuit, protested against their statements: "They have suspected that all that hath come forth of late yers by the Pope's Breves or otherwyse contrairie to their likeing had been procured by his persuasion or by waye of surreption to hinder their designments. . . . In all that troublesome tyme of those bitter invectives agaynts hym nothing could be proved agaynst his sincere dealinge for our good. Whatsoever was then objected to have been his working agaynst theyr designments, it proved still in the end by sundrie Breves to have proceeded directly from his holiness *motu proprio, ex certa scientia, et post magnam deliberationem*, as his holiness affermeth." Bavant to Birkhead, 26th November, 1608. Arch. S.J., Rom. Anglia 36, ii, ff. 304-310. Similarly it is often stated that Worthington was chosen to succeed Barret as President of Douay by Persons's influence. It is contradicted by the letters of Cajetan to Worthington 29th June, 1599, and to R. Hall and J. Wright, 1st June, 1599, where Worthington is said to be the choice almost of all and that the Douay people concerned had nominated him *imprimis ac praecipue inter alios*. West. Arch. VI. Nos. 90. 91.

asserted, "can easily seem a kind of vice-Pope for England." One would have thought that even without an intimate knowledge of the documents, such well known facts, as Clement VIII's rejection of the scheme for two bishops, presented by Persons, his final decision of the controversy in 1602, and his exiling of the Jesuit from Rome in 1605 would have precluded such an unfounded, and, to be frank, rather absurd statement. The documents, it need hardly be added, do not support it. Similarly the decision to appoint an archpriest is represented as being taken on the advice of the Jesuits alone, without "one of the four hundred secular priests being consulted." The contrary is shown by the letter of the Protector, Cardinal Cajetan, to the Nuncio in Flanders, written the day after his letter to Blackwell announcing the latter's election as Archpriest,¹ as well as by the letter of the six Assistants to the same Nuncio, the 12th of May, 1601.² The author seems quite unaware that the scheme for two bishops, which Persons presented to the Pope, and which he made great, though unsuccessful efforts, to get accepted, being allowed to explain the reasons in its favour to the Cardinals of the Inquisition, was not Persons' own, but had been sent to Rome by the "Catholics of England."³ Nor does he realise that the decision to appoint an Archpriest was taken only after the question had been thrashed out by very mature deliberation, extending

¹ Cajetan to the Nuncio, 8th March, 1598, Knox, Douay Diaries, p. 399.

² "Post hoc [i.e., Fisher's Memorial against the Jesuits] rursus cum res nostrae mirum in modum turbarentur, nec esset inter nos aliquis superior qui cum potestate ipsos fluctus compesceret, visum est aliquot piis sacerdotibus cum consensu aliorum complurium ad suam Sanctitatem scribere ut . . . aliquem modum subordinationis daret quem meliorem judicaret, et eundem ordinem sua auctoritate confirmaret; quod et factum est." Naples, Biblioteca Bracciana, Segnatura III. B. 3. Italics mine. The letter is signed by J. Bavant, N. Tyrrwhit, R. Parker, G. Birkhead, W. Hanse and W. Singleton. It is cited by Persons in his Apologie, f. 100. One such letter as that referred to in this citation may be that to Cardinal Cajetan, 14th September, 1597, Arch. West. VI. p. 59. It is signed by C. Southworth, P. Stranguish, T. Bramston, N. Tyrrwhit, J. Bavant and G. Blackwell. Not one in these lists is a Jesuit!

³ Cf. Persons to the Pope, 13th August, 1597. Coll. P. f. 355. Tierney prints the scheme, III, p. cxvii. His note, *Ibid.* cxix, is marked by his usual inaccuracy. Persons in his Apologie, 101v. does not claim the scheme as his own, as Tierney says he does. There is a copy of the scheme among Mgr. Peña's papers, Bibl. Vat. Lat. 6227, f. 25. He mentions it in his "relation" *Ibid.* ff. 7-21, and his letter to the Spanish Ambassador in Rome enclosing a copy is dated 16th August, 1597. *Ibid.* f. 22. There is another copy in Arch. Vat. Borghese III, 124 c. f. 134, addressed to Cardinal Aldobrandino and endorsed "Cum San^{mo}. in Conge. Sⁱ Officii Inquisitionis pro rebus Anglicanis." This shows that it was submitted to the Pope and the Cardinals of the Inquisition as Persons relates in his Apologie f. 101v. Persons's account is also confirmed by the letter of M. Array, Rome, 17th February, 1599, and by that of W. Bishop, Rome, 20th February, 1599. Law, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 120, 124.

over two years.¹ Choice was finally made of Blackwell on the recommendation of many and because of his personal reputation.²

It is quite erroneous, too, to represent the appointment as causing a "tense state of feeling among the secular clergy." Those who objected to it, were a mere handful. Far from the appointment causing chagrin, it was warmly welcomed by clergy and laity alike. There is overwhelming evidence to show this.³ Even one of those who went to protest against and endeavour to reverse the decision, came to realise this on his arrival in Rome. In a letter, probably to Bagshaw, of February 20th, 1599, Bishop writes: "Concerning our Archpresbiter he hath so plentiful approbation out of our country, such high commendacions out of all coastes abroad, soe mightie support in this place, that it had been but meere follie for us meane men, sent but from a fewe, to have opposed ourselves agaynst hym."⁴

These are not merely faults of detail: they affect the very foundation of Fr. Hughes's account, which can only be described as tendentious and misleading. He has relied almost exclusively on the writings of the Appellants and on Tierney, and appears not to be aware that the wild surmises of the former, who were not in a position to know what were the proceedings in Rome, need to be controlled at every step by first-hand evidence, nor that Tierney was acquainted with but a tithe of the documents now available to students of the subject. There is need, indeed, of a large work on the Archpriest Controversy; for that of Fr. Pollen, who had a

¹ Brief of Clement VIII, 17th August, 1601. Tierney-Dodd, III, cxlix. Cf. also Cajetan to Blackwell, 12th January, 1599. Law, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 107.

² Brief of Clement VIII, 17th August, 1601, *ut supra*.

³ Cf. Persons to Garnet, 12 and 13th July, 1598; Law, *op. cit.* vol. I, p. 21; Garnet to Colleton, 11th November, *Ibid.* p. 79; Holtby's Letter, 30th June, 1601, *Ibid.*, p. 191; R. Barret, L. Webb, W. Harrison, M. Kellison, to Cajetan, 25th October, 1598, *Ibid.*, p. 134; The Procurators charges against the Appellants, 10th January, 1599. *Ibid.* pp. 111 and 124. Blackwell and Assistants to the Pope, 1st August, 1598. Arch. Vat. Borghese II, 448 ab. f. 358. Blackwell to the Pope, 1st November, 1598. *Ibid.* f. 394. Cajetan to Blackwell, 10th November, 1598, Tierney-Dodd III, cxxv. Cf. also Persons's Apologie ff. 105-107. The very small number of those who objected to the appointment is attested by their two representatives who went to Rome to protest. "Interrogati hi duo missi quantus sit numerus sacerdotum omnium qui in Anglicana vinea hodie versantur, respondit uterque ipsorum quod plus minusve tercentum. Interrogati vero quot ex istis suarum esse partium, et velle starē eis quae ab ipsis tractantur unus respondit 12, alter 14; sex autem ex istis sunt ex detentis in carcere Wisbicensi." Summary of their examinations in Rome. Turin, Archivio di Stato, Raccolta Mongardino, vol. 61, doc. 12. Blackwell and Holtby put the number of the Appellants at that time at 12 and 10 or 12 respectively; Cf. their respective letters above, that of Blackwell, 1st November, 1598.

⁴ Law, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 124.

knowledge of the contemporary records, second to none, well-balanced and objective though it be, is all too short and after a manner incomplete.

Similar faults to the above appear in Fr. Hughes's treatment of the subsequent period. "From now on (1598) the secular clergy," he writes, "never ceased to beg that this system of government should give way to the more normal rule of bishops, and the question of bishop or no bishop rapidly became a party question between Jesuits and seculars, for from now on the Jesuits steadily fought all schemes to appoint a bishop. Inevitably the appointment of a bishop, if and when it came, must mark a Jesuit defeat." Such a statement is based on the false identification of a vociferous Appellant party with the secular clergy, a crafty subterfuge employed by their leaders and against which Dr. Bavant protested to the Archpriest as late as 1608.¹ Persons himself continued to be in favour of episcopal government as he had been from his mission days in England.² His later letters attest it. But he saw, as did the Pope, the Cardinals and others to whom the question was submitted, the difficulties that lay in the way of establishing it.³ The

¹ "They name themselves and some others with them the body of the clergie of England: under which name many things may be wrought to the great prejudice of their brethren and many others." Bavant to Birkhead, 26th November, 1608. Arch. S.J. Rom. Anglia 36, ii, f. 304. That they formed a party among the clergy is clear from Persons's letter to the Pope, 6th July, 1608 reporting Birkhead's letter of the 15th of May. After a passage concerning the Oath of Allegiance, he continues: "The same Archpriest writes to me that the disaffected party are pressing very hard to have bishops and to send two of their numbers to Rome to ask for it: they declare that they will never settle down quietly unless they obtain this." He then gives the substance of his reply, his letter to Birkhead, 5th July, 1608, which also shows that the Appellants were a party and not the whole body of the clergy. Tierney Dodd V, p. xxxii, cf. also Persons to Birkhead, 31st May, 1608. *Ibid.*, p. xxix. The original Italian of Persons's letter to the Pope is in Arch. Vat. Borghese IV 86, f. 30. The same point is shown by a letter of a priest, 22nd April, 1610, in which he praises the granting of a clergy agent; as making for union, and continues "Without doubt, had ear been lent to the impertinent complaints of these few malcontents there would never be an end of them." Another writes on 5th of May, 1610, that the granting of an agent "had rendered the Appellants much quieter": *Avisi d' Inghilterra*. Arch. S.J. Rom. Anglia 31, 1, f. 360.

² "And as to my aversion therein, God seeth that I am no less wronged therein, than in many other reports, which I leave, as only accountable to Him. The simple truth is that I was never averted from it, but always did see many reasons for it." Persons to Birkhead, 5th July, 1608. Cf. also his letter of the 21st August, 1608. Tierney-Dodd V, pp. xxxii, xxxvii.

³ "The point of bishops is ungrateful to no man here, but rather much desired, if it might please his Holiness to resolve it: from which also he is not much alienated or averse, if he might see the difficulties removed, that partly himself doth conceive, and partly have been proposed by others, both from your parts and of this side the sea." Persons to Birkhead, 5th July, 1608.

Appellants simply refused to consider these,¹ or to acquiesce in the Pope's decision, and were opposed by a considerable body of opinion in England. It was not a Jesuit, but a secular priest, one of the Archpriest's Assistants, who wrote to the Pope in 1607, strongly emphasising the inexpediency of episcopal rule in the conditions then obtaining. "He has heard from England," he writes, "that Catholics take it ill in the present perturbed state of affairs, that there are not wanting some who are pressing your Holiness to appoint bishops. So great are the harmful effects of such a course that I am amazed how it could enter anyone's head to urge the petition in the present circumstances. The appointment of bishops will bring everyone into certain danger, cause the ruin of very many, and result in no good. Rather than burden your Holiness with a long letter, I have forwarded to Fr. Fitzherbert what is the opinion of all priests of any eminence amongst us, what that of the laity. Catholic laymen are almost unanimous in predicting that it will entail great disaster to the Church. They will, assuredly, bear it ill, if to their other burdens there is added this further burden, which appears to them the last straw."²

Dr. Bavant is another witness; he was not a Jesuit, but a secular priest, venerable for his age, talents and long labours in England. On the fall of Blackwell, whilst a successor had not been appointed, hearing of the petition for bishops, he as senior Assistant wrote to Rome in January, 1608, as he had written eight years before to Cardinal Cajetan, to prevent such "prejudicial sutes," alleging reasons why during the days of persecution the appointment of bishops was inexpedient³: All this he relates in a long letter to Birkhead, who under pressure from the Appellant party had asked him to explore the views of the clergy in his district. Again in the same year, he wrote to the Cardinal Protector,

¹ "They [the Appellants] pay no attention to the immense difficulties which will follow on it, as your Holiness will perceive from the arguments on either side, which I have handed to the Cardinal Protector to lay before your Holiness, as you ordered me to do. Along with this on a separate sheet, we have set down some remedies for some of the difficulties." Persons to the Pope, 6th July, 1608. Cardinal Bellarmine's position on the question was similar to that of the Pope. Cf. J. Brodrick "Venerable Robert Bellarmine," vol. II, pp. 281-285. The Pope, Cardinal Bellarmine and others appreciated the position of bishops in the church, so well brought out by the author, pp. 290-291.

² Singleton to Pope, 15th September, 1607, Arch. S.J. Rom. Anglia 31, 1, f. 320. Singleton had been exiled from England with 45 other priests in July, 1606.

³ Bavant to Birkhead, 26th November, 1608. Arch. S.J. Rom. Anglia 36, 11, 304-310.

approving the appointment of Birkhead, as Archpriest, and stating that "in no way was it advisable to change that form of government."¹ Some time later, when a new attempt was begun to get priests to sign a petition for episcopal government, he wrote again, this time to Persons. In this letter, he reviewed from 1598 onwards the whole history of the efforts to obtain bishops, made by the Appellants, four more of whom had recently been appointed Assistants. Again he stressed the inexpediency of such a step, setting down various reasons that militated against it, commented on the ambiguous methods used to obtain subscriptions² and added, by way of contrast, that when the previous year the question had been put openly and directly very many had answered in the negative. Finally he begged Persons to inform the authorities in Rome, and remarked that he would not have written so often on the matter, were it not that he feared the opposing party would by way of information urge upon the Holy See, a course that would turn to the danger of all.³

With such information before him, is it surprising that the Pope should still hesitate even when there was presented to him by the clergy agent in Rome a petition in favour of bishops signed by one hundred and forty odd of the English clergy?⁴ These subscriptions represented the result of eighteen months and more of unremitting effort on the part of the leaders.⁵ In 1598, within but a few months, well nigh two hundred had written welcoming the appointment of an Archpriest and disapproving of the dozen or so who

¹ The letter is not extant, but is known from a letter to the Pope by Thomas Fitzherbert, 27th July, 1608, summarising letters from England, this amongst them. Arch. Vat. Borghese III, 19, i, 134.

² Another priest remarks on this in a letter of 5th May, 1610: "ne (sono) tanto solliciti come prima in cercare et raccorre *con inganno* li nomi di Preti in favore delli lor disegni et discordie." Avisi, 1610. Arch. S.J. Anglia 31, 1, f. 360.

³ Bavant to Persons, 28th March, 1610. Arch. S.J. Rom. 31, ii, ff. 374-375. Persons never received the letter, for he had left this troubled world on 15th April, 1610.

⁴ The memorials were signed by 144. There is a difficulty in reconciling the numbers in Appellants' letters with this figure. Tierney's explanation may be the correct one; but in view of Bavant's letter to Persons, it can only be received with caution.

⁵ Birkhead to the Pope, 11th July, 1611. Tierney-Dodd, vol. V., p. cxlii. Of Mush, a secular priest writes 20th May, 1610, "Il Sor Musheo, ci va stringendo con una violenza molto grande volentes nolentes di sottoscrivere per la petitione di vescovi e di nominare alcuni a questo effetto." Arch. S.J. Rom. Anglia 31, 1, 366-7. He was not always successful as this letter and that of another priest to F. Blount show. *Ibid* f. 366v.

held back from recognising him.¹ The contrast between the quick response of 1598 and the laboured reply of 1610-1611, may well have struck Paul V, as it strikes the student to-day; for Paul V, it must be remembered, had been conversant with the movement for bishops since its inception. In any case, the petition clearly did not constitute that unanimous consent of the Catholics of England, which, in 1609, he had laid down as an essential condition for granting bishops. Apart from the numerous priests who had not signed, the opinion of one section of the Catholic community was almost entirely lacking, that of the laity. True, Lord Montague had written in support of the petition; but that only served to emphasise the silence of other lay Catholics. The Pope therefore in his perplexity sought for further enlightenment, surely a wise course in view of the statements made by Singleton but a few years earlier. The Nuncio in France, Mgr. Ubaldini, Bishop of Montepulciano, was accordingly instructed to gather information in a quiet way, particularly on what the laity thought of the matter and what the effects were likely to be of the appointment of bishops, and then to give his opinion.² A similar letter was sent to Mgr. Bentivoglio, Archbishop of Rhodes, the Nuncio in Flanders.³ The answer of the latter is extant. In it he gives reasons for and against the proposal but decides that the safer course is to maintain the existing form of government and not introduce bishops into England.⁴ In accordance with this opinion Paul V made his decision. Henceforth, so long as he lived, in the instructions given to a new Nuncio in Flanders there was always inserted a paragraph enjoining him to prevent as a matter already decided any further attempt—should it be made—to open the question, or to remit it to Rome.⁵

In the light of the evidence here submitted, it may be asked, is it historically accurate to characterise the upholders of the opposing forms of Government, as the secular clergy on the one hand, advocating episcopal rule for the good

¹ Cf. Martin Array's Letter, Rome, 17th February, 1599: Cajetan to Blackwell, 10th November, 1599. Persons to Garnet, 12th and 13th July, 1598: his Apologie, ff. 105v.-107.

² Borghese to the Nuncio in France, 15th August, 1612, apud H. Laemmer's *Meletematum Romanorum Mantissa*, Ratisbon, 1875, p. 319.

³ Borghese to Bentivoglio, 30th August, 1612, apud Bellesheim's *Wilhelm, Cardinal Allen*, Mainz, 1885, p. 281. Cf. also p. 217.

⁴ Bentivoglio to Borghese, 6th and 20th October. Naples, *Archivio di Stato*, *Carte Farnesiane*, 429, ff. 480-485.

⁵ Thus in 1615, 1617 and 1619. Cf. "Recueil des Instructions Générales aux Nonces de Flandre, (1596-1635)." A Cauchie and R. Maere, pp. 50, 69, 93.

of the Church in England, and the Jesuits, on the other hand opposing it for their own private and selfish interests ; and is Rome to be condemned for following a course which after mature deliberation and with the advice of many prudent and zealous advisers, the Pope saw to be necessitated by the conditions then obtaining in England.

Much remains to be said of Fr. Hughes's account of the Chalcedon controversy which is equally tendentious, but limits of space make it necessary to postpone all discussion of that topic to a future occasion.

L. HICKS.

The Cherry Orchard

A CHERRY orchard every spring is veiling
 A broken shrine upon a distant hill
 With misty blossoms that are ever trailing
 Where you and I once strayed, and time stood still.
 The petals, falling very slowly, kissed
 Our upturned faces with a snowy mist,
 And over all our dream of love held sway,—
 Ah, that was holy day !

O dream within a dream ! Still must I savour
 Its dust and ashes, sacred and profane,—
 As spring returns with its immortal flavour
 Of youth and love,—again and yet again.
 To kneel and pray before a lonely cross—
 To know the passion and the pain of loss ;
 To weep my soul in bitter grief away,—
 This too was holy day.

O cherry orchard, blooming far away !
 The years that pass, and rob me of my sorrow
 Shall never mar your loveliness. To-morrow
 This human heart may be dissolved to clay,—
 But still the wind will strew your blossoms where
 My soul is ever turning with its prayer.
 There, by a broken shrine beside the way
 'Tis always holy day.

HELEN NICHOLSON.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

HISTORIC SILVER FROM HOLYROOD

AMONG the old Scottish silver included in the Exhibition of Scottish Art in London during 1939 shone a graceful Jacobean bell, bearing the crowned monogram and catalogued thus :—

“ Mass Bell. Lent by the Bishop of Aberdeen. Maker's mark : Z.M. (unrecorded). Assay Master : John Borthwick. Bell with baluster handle, engraved J.R., crowned [James II.] ; silver. Edinburgh, 1686. Saved along with other sacred vessels by the Catholic Chaplain Father David Burnet when the Edinburgh mob, with six hundred of the town guard, attacked the Royal Palace of Holyrood and despoiled the Chapel. This was towards the end of December, 1688, after the defeat of King James II at the Battle of the Boyne. H. : 4½ in.”

A few years ago the present writer was privileged to see most of those historic sacred vessels, still in use. The full story of the Scottish priest's heroism is recorded among the Blairs MSS., and is worth telling in print.

On December 10th (20th), 1688, one of His Majesty's chaplains attached to the Chapel Royal, Holyrood, sat in his room at sunset on a bitter frosty evening. But the Rev. David Burnet felt less comfortably secure than he appeared. A convert, born in the diocese of St. Andrew's, and a student of Paris and Rome, his reputation both for character and eloquence stood high. A priest familiar with the whole university of Padua pronounced him the best speaker he had ever heard. And Mr. Burnet (only religious were then called Father) was one of many who judged His most worthy but most obstinate Majesty's present flaunting of the old Faith in the face of the Edinburgh ministers and their inflammable followers to be very ill-advised. Another was that great Catholic the first Duke of Gordon, soon to prove one of the last loyal to King James in Scotland. Such men saw the danger of the enraged denunciations thundering from the city pulpits, and made savage by fear of a reversal of power.

But the King turned a deaf ear and went inflexibly on the way he was convinced to be the right one. Here in Edinburgh he followed the Faith of his forefathers so publicly that the clock seemed to have been put back some hundred and twenty years. The venerable Chapel Royal of Holyrood was restored to the old worship, then in 1687 the largest hall in the Palace was adapted temporarily while the historic chapel was richly embellished. Nearly 8,000 crowns were spent on this, probably including these

very silver vessels. A staff of seven or eight priests was selected, Mr. Burnet ranking second under the Dean and Almoner to the King, Mr. Dunbar. This was an alias necessitated by the severe penal laws against Catholics; his real name was Gray, and after being a chaplain at Gordon Castle he became Prefect of the Scottish Mission, then numbering twenty-two priests working cautiously about the country in peril of their lives. Here, however, priests—even Jesuits—walked the High Street openly in clerical garb, under royal protection. They preached instructional sermons at Holyrood, drawing crowds at least as much as did pealing bells, fine music and stately ceremonial. Schools were re-established, and the appointment of a bishop advocated, despite the opinion of many priests that this was untimely: Mr. Burnet's own name was considered for the mitre, he being "pious, learned, prudent and laborious." But this very prudence caused his misgivings.

Suddenly a new sound outside caught his ear, always alert for alarm by day or night. He recognised at once the roar of an enraged mob, approaching rapidly from the High Street; an ill sound to hear in the frosty stillness. Springing up, he sacrificed his own possessions and rushed to the Chapel to save as many sacred vessels as he could and to give warning. The air rang with the yelling mob, seven hundred strong and now reinforced by six hundred of the traitorous Town Guard and Train Band, storming the Palace. As Mr. Burnet escaped in the icy dusk towards Leith, they swept through Holyrood into the chapel: wrenching out every treasure it contained, tearing down the lovely unfinished woodwork, piling it all, with books, rich vestments and sacred furnishings, on the gigantic bonfire in the outer court, where towering flames crackled furiously amid swirling smoke in the crisp, still air. Several turncoat nobles, the old curse of Scotland, mingled with the mob, urging them on. In addition, 920 crowns' worth of ecclesiastical loot was carried off; and for several succeeding days the rioters glutted their frenzy by pillaging Catholic houses about Edinburgh.

About four on that first morning, when darkness and frost were most intense, Mr. Burnet was forced from the shelter of a friendly roof by the yells of these roaming gangs. Clutching his precious burden, he wandered in the open fields until daybreak. Then, hiring a boat about half a mile above Leith, he crossed the Forth and took horse for the north, determined both to warn all the priests within reach and to find safety in that consistently Catholic district, the Enzie, both for himself and for the sacred treasures he had saved at the cost of all his own possessions and the risk of his life.

Thus began an epic ride, for his escape was rumoured and already the hunt was hot on his heels. His trail was picked up before he was half an hour beyond Kirkcaldy, though he neither stopped nor spoke to anyone there. But in about a mile he outrode his pursuers, and, gaining Montrose, dared to snatch a brief

rest, badly needed. He was scarcely in the saddle again, leaving the town, when the magistrates got wind of him and searched his temporary lodging. Yet still he contrived to warn the clergy on his way, notably in that stronghold of the old Faith, Aberdeen. Riding hard, on and on and on, at length he reached the Enzie, and handed over his treasures into faithful keeping.

There he paid the price for a whole year, lurking now on the hill of Auldmore, near Keith—usually with another priest, Alexander Leslie—now in cottages, where he had to flit frequently because his welcome presence both straitened and imperilled his staunch hosts. Familiar with cold and hunger, he spent the winter in a roughly improvised hut. In spring he was sent on another adventurous journey (on foot and in open boats) with a message of loyalty to King James from the clergy and some Catholic lay leaders. Thence he went to Paris, devoting himself to pleading his distressed brethren's cause strenuously with Rome. At length his earnest endeavour to resume missionary work in Scotland succeeded. A doubly-marked man, he landed at Ython Mouth, near Aberdeen in November, 1690, to continue his hazardous ministry in the Enzie for another five years.

The subsequent history of the sacred vessels he saved worthily crowns his heroism. Faithfully treasured by succeeding generations, they remain in use to this day, with only one tragic exception. In the summer of 1847 the lesser chalice was recovered only in fragments from a common burglar, at Tynet, to the deep grief of priest and people. The larger one, tall and elaborate, is among the treasures of Blairs College: the ciborium is still in use in the north, as also is the Mass bell. The present writer was also privileged to see the monstrance, censer and incense boat saved from Holyrood. The former is the handsomest of all, gilt and set with Scottish jewels, crystal and pebble, the base wrought with floral scroll designs and bosses of cherub heads. At the back is the royal monogram, crowned. The richly ornate censer and boat are frequently used with it, the latter marked 'James VII.'

In his stricken sorrow at the loss of the lesser chalice the priest of Tynet in 1847 wrote a worthy epitaph appropriate to all these still-cherished historic vessels:—"The simple people knew its history and loved it as an heirloom of their faith. . . . It had stood before them for nearly 160 years, telling the same tale to each generation, of their persecuted and exiled fathers. It had passed safely through the perils of the midnight offering in barns and sheds, with their frequent alarms and hidings. It had escaped the search of Cumberland's soldiers when the descendant of the donor sought in vain his father's throne. It had come down to our own peaceful days." He concludes by saying that many, like himself, would have given ten years of life for its rescue; "he, the last who ever elevated it before the people, and held in his hand the gift twice given to God, once by a king, and once by a brave priest."

NOEL MACDONALD WILBY.

II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

- BLACKFRIARS** : July, 1942. **Christians in Germany.** [A timely number devoted to the pre-war Christian position in Germany, with special reference to the thought of Guardini and Przywara, and the Catholic liturgical and social movements.]
- CLERGY REVIEW** : July, 1942. **Christian Co-operation,** by Very Rev. Canon E. J. Mahoney. [Contains some valuable notes on this up-to-date problem, with the text and translation of some relevant passages from Papal documents.]
- COMMON CAUSE** : July 5th, 1942. **The Birthday of a Friendship,** by Jan Rembielinski. [The editor of the bilingual "Sprawa" or "Common Cause" recalls two years of Anglo-Polish friendship since the fall of France.]
- COMMONWEAL** : April 17th, 1942. **The West and the Further-West,** by Julien Benda. [An interesting study of what might be the loss and gain to Western European civilization of closer contact with the United States. M. Benda decides the loss would be *artistic* but the gain a *moral* one.]
- DUBLIN REVIEW** : July-Sept., 1942. **Christian Freedom,** by Christopher Dawson. [Has some illuminating passages upon an urgent and—at times—a somewhat misunderstood question.]
- GRAIL MAGAZINE** : No. 5, 1942. **Prayer.** [A simple and yet helpful issue, dealing with the general subject of personal prayer.]
- IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD** : June and July, 1942. **Youth Organization in France,** by Rev. R. S. Devane, S.J. [Giving a detailed examination of the various Youth Movements that are developing in Unoccupied France.]
- IRISH ROSARY** : July-Aug., 1942. **A Letter from London,** by Peter Pensive. [A charming appreciation of Mr. Hilaire Belloc both as poet and historian.]
- STUDIES** : June, 1942. **India in the War and After,** by Frederick C. King. [A straightforward and objective account of India's problems and of the many lines of cleavage, religious and political, among the people of India.]
- TABLET** : July 11th, 1942. **British Propaganda to Urban and to Rural Europe.** [Has some sound and timely criticism of our present propaganda to the European peoples and points out mistakes that have been made and opportunities that are being missed.]
- VOLONTAIRE** : June 24th, 1942. **Nouvelles du Front de la Résistance Spirituelle.** [Includes some inspiring extracts from a series of "Cahiers du Témoignage Chrétien" which continue to appear—unofficially of course—in France.]

REVIEWS

1—A DECLARATION OF DEPENDENCE¹

MGR. SHEEN has written a large number of books, ranging from the solidly philosophic "God and Intelligence" and "Religion without God" to his later volumes which have a more topical and popular appeal. The latest inverts a familiar American title and reminds us of a highly vital principle. "In these days when everyone talks of rights and few of duties, it is important for us Americans to recall that the Declaration of Independence is also a Declaration of Dependence . . . it asserts a double dependence: dependence on God, and dependence on law as derived from God."

We have to remember that this volume was written and even published before America's entry into the war and previously to Hitler's attack on Russia. This explains why Stalin is regularly included in the rogues' gallery—along with Hitler and Mussolini. Not that Mgr. Sheen will have altered his opinion of Communism: but there is no appreciation of Russian courage to counter-balance that inclusion.

The book has some strong meat for the modern digestion. The illustrations are vivid and trenchant. The dreamers of a post-war Utopia are reminded that "the Church is not optimistic about history; it has always seen that the final product of history will be anti-Christ, the concentration of diabolical evil in human souls. And the only way out of that horror will be, not a new social order, but the Second Coming of Christ to judge the living and the dead." We are living amidst the shards and ruins of Liberalism and Progress. Mgr. Sheen lays down a prickly gauntlet to the facile and the wishfully-thinking.

The chapter on "Providence and War" is admirable. It answers—effectively and graphically—those who ask why God does not interfere more blatantly with His handiwork. After keeping the Church out of politics for countless years, men now ask why the Church is not sufficiently powerful to prevent wars. To those who demand "Where is God now?" he answers, "Where are your gods now?", those gods to whose service you have persuaded men—science, humanism, progress, and the rest of it.

Justice, not liberty—that is the author's test and standard of this world war, with which he identifies himself whole-heartedly even prior to his country's active entry. A war can be *just*, he argues, without being, in the stricter sense, *holy*. And yet "it can be holy for certain individuals in the nation who regard it as a

¹ *A Declaration of Dependence*, by Mgr. Fulton J. Sheen. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company. Pp. vii, 140. 1941.

duty laid on them in order that God's law of righteousness be maintained among men." And still he insists upon asking the question: "Who really wanted this war?"—In general not the great mass of people. "Yet we have war, a demonic, hellish war. Why have we something we did not will? Because we willed something evil; we willed to be without God and His justice, and by willing that initial evil we produced an effect we did not intend, namely, the war. In that sense, this war is a judgment of God." What Hitler has done, has been to push to its logical consequence the errors of atheism and selfishness that have been taught for decades in American schoolrooms. "He has, with a frightening consistency, swept away all laws, customs, politics, and economics which paid lip service to God but denied Him in practice." And he applies to Hitler that prophetic sentence from Dostoevsky's "Letters from the Underworld," a title reminiscent of "The Screwtape Letters": "I should not be surprised if there should suddenly arise from some quarter or other, some low-born gentleman, a man of retrograde and cynical character, who, setting his arms akimbo should say to all of you 'How now, gentlemen? Would it not be a good thing if, with one consent, we were to kick all this solemn wisdom to the four winds, and send all these logarithms to the devil and to begin our lives over again according to our own sweet pleasure.'"

This is a sound, healthy and outspoken book. Remember all the time that it was conceived before the war between the United States and Japan, and prior to the German-Russian conflict. And then you will appreciate it.

2—SOUTHWARD JOURNEY¹

MR. HALLIDAY SUTHERLAND needs no introduction as traveller and *raconteur*. After the Lapland forests and the glens and mountains of his native Highlands, he now takes us a longer journey through the continent of Australia. Early in September, 1939, he was in Bombay, already *en route* for the Southern continent. After a slight war-delay he was soon landing at Fremantle.

Dr. Sutherland is an observant, versatile and witty guide, whatever his subject matter and wherever he may chance to be. More than this. He has obviously a good background of information and knowledge. Through the many scenes and incidents that are recorded there gleams an appreciation of Australian history and a genuine sympathy with the Australian character and with Australian problems. The scenes and incidents are varied enough. Now he is "hob-nobbing" with Cabinet ministers—he tells us of his pleasant thrill when three past Prime Ministers

¹ *Southward Journey*, by Halliday Sutherland. London: Geoffrey Bles. Pp. 320. Price, 15s. n. 1942.

appeared on the platform at one of his lectures at Canberra—now we discover him at a race meeting, whether at the trotting track in the People's Playground near Perth (the largest of its kind in the world) or on the Flemington course not far from Melbourne. Perth, Adelaide, Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane—there are descriptions and sketches of them, along with smaller towns, such as Albury and Corowa, and many stations, mining and agricultural. We can read of his experiences with statesmen and bishops, with medical superintendents and journalists, and even with the police. Through four or five pages we find the author speeding in a police-car, mysteriously named "The Blue Bird," through the criminal quarters of Sydney.

Australian fruits may taste of turpentine—that is Dr. Sutherland's verdict on the mango and papaw—but he is interested in them and even more in the remarkable variety of Australian trees. Readers of Dr. Sutherland's earlier travel books will recall similar chapters, especially upon the trees and woods of Norway and Finland. If you want to know what a "fossicker" is, then you must turn these pages. But, whatever you do, do not make the fatal mistake of confusing a "sundowner" with a "swagman." Both may be on the tramp or, in Australian language, "humping the bluey," but the "sundowner" is a man who looks for work but hopes sincerely never to discover it, whereas the "swagman" is a respectable working man, on the road in search of employment.

Dr. Sutherland is no uncritical imperialist and he has a shrewd eye for political issues. Still he retains his conviction that "in our dealings with subject races we have nothing to learn from any other colonizing power." In the nineteenth century, "as soon as any European left the shores of Europe, he or she was under the Pax Britannica, and in the main it was British prestige that protected the lives and liberties of the white races in foreign lands. In other words Britain has been the leader of a civilization whose traditions are European, whose culture is Western, so that if in this war Britain were defeated—if we lost our possessions in the Far East, if we lost India, and the control of the Suez Canal—all Western Europe and the United States would share the consequences of that defeat."

Finally, this volume contains a large number of pages that will be of special interest to Catholics. There is much that touches upon the development of the faith in Australia. Notices of the earliest missionaries lead up to an appreciation of the Catholic position to-day, with reference to the efforts that have been made for Catholic education. The Irish Christian Brothers are singled out for particular praise. They came to Australia from Ireland in 1868, and they have now more than fifty orphanages, schools and colleges. The author entertains us with an account of his visit to four of them, all in Western Australia. Their work is remarkable for its co-ordination and its practical results. Bishops and priests keep turning up in these traveller's pages, and they are an admirable

company. Then one must not miss the description of a Catholic pageant-play, *Credo*; it was performed on the famous cricket ground of Melbourne. Dr. Sutherland very wisely managed to hide his vulnerable Achilles' heel until his departure. Had the Australians spotted it earlier, there might have been trouble. The "heel" was simply that he loathed cricket. He was lucky to get away with that "heel."

J. M.

3—AN ANGLO-IRISH HOUSE¹

MISS BOWEN is known already as a novelist of considerable distinction. In her latest book she switches to another and a more personal theme and she browses affectionately over the story of her own family in Ireland. She is conscious throughout that, despite more than three centuries of residence, that family is, in the last resort, an alien one. Bowen's Court, the family mansion and demesne, is—she frankly allows—"the negation of mystical Ireland." But she loves, and will make her readers love, that fascinating countryside from Mallow through Doneraile to Fermoy, between the Galtee hills and the flashing Blackwater.

The original Colonel Bowen migrated from Wales to Southern Ireland. Miss Bowen tells us that he was a natural *condottiere*, a soldier of fortune whose allegiance to King or Parliament was a highly doubtful quantity. She has no illusions about the character of the Cromwellian settlers or the nature of the settlement. "Sollicitude for investments and dread of Rome plainly dictated the English attitude" (p. 35). Of the two motives, it was the former that inspired the latter and kept it strong. "The complete subjugation and the exploitation of Ireland became the object of the English burgess class. The Sword of the Lord was drawn for the *rentier*."

In tracing the development of one Anglo-Irish family, she lets us see something of the ill-treatment of an entire people. Under the Cromwellian settlement, the true Irish were driven into the wastes of Connaught. "Very large numbers of young boys, mostly about the age of twelve, were exported as workers to the Barbadoes, to the English plantations in America and, later, to Jamaica. 'Who knows,' wrote Henry Cromwell, 'but it might be a means to make them Englishmen—I mean, Christians?' Young widows (or wives bereft of their husbands) and girls were exported to the Barbadoes, where they were short of women. Jamaica also put in for a thousand Irish girls. This traffic was only checked by a scandal—some English young people were inadvertently seized."

"Cromwell's hired toughs"—this is the authoress's verdict upon the settlers. But such was the political confusion in Europe that the Catholic cathedral in Vienna pealed with a Thanksgiving *Te Deum* for the defeat of the Catholic Irish at the Battle of the

¹ *Bowen's Court*, by Elizabeth Bowen. London: Longmans, Green. Pp. viii, 340. Price: 16s. n. 1942.

Boyne. The problem of cleansing the Catholic mind from unworthy nationalist or political complications is evidently no new one.

The Bowen family history and the history of Ireland are interwoven in this book. For the general reader, the former may have no great interest though it is skilfully and humanly presented. The wider background is one of generous sympathy with the aspirations of the native Irish. Miss Bowen traces the activity of the Irishmen of 1798, of O'Connell and of the Irish Parliamentary party. Naturally the shadows lengthen when she comes to the story of the past twenty years. There may have been much to admire and appreciate in the Anglo-Irish society of which she writes, and for that she regrets its passing.

The book was begun in Ireland; "about half of it has been written at my father's desk." "The other half was written in London, returned to on curious mornings when the smoke and the smell of raids still hung in the air." Bowen's Court still stands and it succeeded in escaping the attention of the incendiaries during the Revolution.

4—CHRISTOCRACY¹

THIS book falls neatly into two portions. The first is an analysis of the circumstances that have led to war; the second is a collection of suggestions for a fairer future. The first is one-sided, incomplete and, I think, misleading. The second is good and is in keeping with some of the best of Christian war-time thought.

In his analysis Mr. Middleton Murry assures us that our troubles can all be traced back to one simple source. "The machine has been too much for us." What should have enabled mankind to live at a far higher level of existence, in greater freedom and fraternity, is become the instrument of a new extremity of mutual destruction. This is true enough. But when he comes to examine the present situation, one has the impression that he is attaching the major share of the blame to Britain. Somehow the British Navy is the major villain of the piece. "The responsibility for the choice—though choice is hardly the word—of this barbarous solution of the impasse created by British sea power falls primarily upon Britain."

Mr. Middleton Murry has written books upon the necessity both of Pacifism and of Communism. He admits that he remains a pacifist though at the same time "a grateful citizen of a country where pacifism is permitted": Communism he has abjured. But he retains something of his former background and considers the war in purely economic terms. For him it was caused by the problem of unemployment. He has nothing to say about German race-pride and arrogance or about Nazi aims and methods.

At times the argument is very feeble. We cannot be fighting

¹ *Christocracy*, by John Middleton Murry. London: Andrew Dakers. Pp. 157. Price: 6s. n. 1942.

Nazism as a tyranny because we do not always declare war on tyranny. That Britain does not always fight to uphold the rights of peoples is used as an argument that she cannot be sincere in insisting upon the rights and independence of Poland. Mr. Middleton Murry thinks that a clear-cut victory will be impossible of achievement. Could it be achieved, this could be only through our own acceptance of totalitarianism: and that would be in itself defeat. "Fortunately for ourselves—not to speak of the world—it seems unlikely that we shall succeed in inflicting a defeat of this kind upon Germany and Japan" (p. 66). Our purpose now ought to be to withdraw ourselves from wider strategy and to wage a purely defensive war, exerting an influence upon Europe by sea power (which was incidentally pilloried as a major cause of the two world wars) and by the example of a free society.

The first part of the book is unbalanced and, in many ways, wrong-headed. Its author wins a number of debating points at the expense of the real situation.

The second part is different. Quite why the book was given its title is never clear. The author tries to enlighten us in a short appendix but without success. The one note—in his opinion—of a Christian society is *toleration*. Because this finds its expression in English life in parliamentary democracy, the only practical way to a Christian society lies in the retention of that parliamentary democracy. He criticises the five social standards of the joint letter to *The Times* (December 21st, 1940) by stating that the four signatories took toleration and democracy for granted whereas these should have been strongly and explicitly emphasized.

He understands that the gravest danger of the hour is totalitarianism, at home as well as abroad. Against this he declares, very reasonably, that voluntary associations are the most solid safeguard. Joint-stock companies and the Press need to have professional standards like those of medicine and law. Private enterprise must be saved by self-discipline in the general interest. Decentralization and de-urbanization: the creation of communities with a sense of concrete social responsibility: "the simple recognition that the talents of the individual, though they are embodied in him as a person, do not belong to him as an ego": a vocation in work which demands beforehand economic security: not *maximum* output but *optimum* output: the fuller education of youth in positive ideas and ideals, especially of our soldiers on home service: the need to keep this country clear of "the accursed philosophy of violence": these are some of the thoughts put forward by Mr. Middleton Murry, and sane and healthy they indeed are. And they are in harmony with much of the valuable Christian thinking on post-war reconstruction that has been going on in this country during the past two years. The second half of this book redeems to a great extent the incompleteness of the first. But the book would have been better and more helpful had the first part been omitted altogether.

SHORT NOTICES

HISTORICAL

A Detection of Aumbries (Longmans, 3s. 6d. n.) was written by the Anglican Dom Gregory Dix as an appendix to a forthcoming book : but here it is published in advance. It is a most readable and interesting study—following Freestone, Braun and Raible—of the history of "Reservation." The author has in mind several of his Anglican brethren and he is dismissing some of their all too Protestant pre-conceptions. He cites a remarkable passage from the "Apostolic Tradition" of Hippolytus which shows that, in the earliest Christian centuries, the layman was able to communicate himself at home from a reserved host. The purpose of "reservation" was not merely for the convenience of the sick : he points to the custom of sending a host consecrated at the Bishop's mass (this was the *fermentum*) to the various churches which owned his jurisdiction. The major part of the book is concerned with an examination of the different methods that have obtained throughout the centuries. The hanging pyx, the aumbry or ambry, the fixed tabernacle—these are all considered. The author assigns our warmer Eucharistic devotions to Northern Catholicism : Rome's influence was always on the side of restraint. A helpful book.

BIOGRAPHICAL

Miss Erica Oxenham has composed a biography of her distinguished father, known far and wide under his literary name of John Oxenham. The book is entitled initially "J.O." (Longmans, 3s. 6d. n.). John Oxenham was born in Manchester, on November 12th, 1852, as William Arthur Dunkerley. He was the son of a prosperous merchant and his first experience after schooldays was that of an agent of his father's firm in France. This gave him a wider outlook and a thorough knowledge of the French language. Very advisedly, his daughter lets her father's letters speak for themselves. They are graphic and illuminating, and are warm with small and familiar detail. After marriage and a short, and none too successful, business interlude in New York, John Oxenham strolled into Fleet Street. But he was not a journalist for long : he wrote novels (something like forty of them are catalogued) and then turned his attention to widely religious questions. As portrayed in this biography, his character was a charming one. He was sincere and unselfish, and did great good.

PERIODICALS

We have *La France Libre* now published in London to remind us of France in happier and worthier days. Parallel with it is a Belgian monthly review, **Message** (each issue costing 2s. 6d. n.). A recent number, that for June, had articles by the Duke of

Norfolk on British Agriculture ; by Dr. Gottfried Keller, London correspondent of *Basler Nachrichten* and President of the Foreign Press Association in London ; by Dr. Julian Huxley on a National Park in the Belgian Congo ; by Paul Muratoff on the campaigns in Russia. The review is well edited and presented, with good illustrations. It symbolizes the resistance of a people to Nazi pressure : it is a reminder of that people's stand for better things.

ASCETICAL

The Priest's Prayer Book (B.O. and W., 7s. 6d. n.) was composed by its author, Father Christopher Wilmot, S.J., primarily for priests. It consists of a series of meditations on the psalms of the Sunday office. And yet it ranges over most of the fundamental and profound problems of the Christian life. Its Ignatian inspiration is very evident, and indeed it might be taken as a novel epitome of the Spiritual Exercises. It would provide an admirable handbook for a priest's annual retreat, and it has the additional advantage of very concrete and plain-spoken applications. Father Wilmot has had a long and varied priestly experience which he makes available here to others. Several of the addresses were given originally to priest members of the Apostolic Union of Westminster and Southwark. Its use need not, however, be confined to the clergy. Laymen will discover in it succinct and valuable thoughts for their own consideration. Praise, thanksgiving, sin and sorrow, sacrifice, unselfishness and charity—all these themes are competently handled, and they are remote from none of us. The book is very handy in format and will fit neatly into a coat pocket. Unfortunately, the price is high.

MODERN QUESTIONS

The **Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs** we have frequently commended : they are written by experts and provide an admirable background to the many phases of the war. Of the latest handful, No. 57 is entitled **Greece** and is from the pen of Dr. (now Lt.-Col.) Stanley Casson, the author of a number of books on Greece, ancient and modern. This pamphlet reviews Greek development from the days when Byron died for Hellenic freedom. It notes the growth of a nationalistic spirit that was in time to over-reach itself and call into being modern Turkey. Throughout Mr. Casson dwells upon those Greek qualities that have been the inspiration of all Western peoples. He speaks of their gallant resistance to the Italian attack and has a final word of sympathy with them in their serious plight to-day. Bulgaria appears as the villain of Balkan politics, and the Bulgars need showing that their foul and brutal behaviour deserves drastic punishment.

In **Great Britain and China** (No. 58) Sir John Pratt summarises the relations of this country with the Far East. He is more than qualified to do so because of his long consular experience. The war will inevitably see far-reaching changes in remote Asia

and the Pacific, and it is certain that China will play a most important part in such developments.

It is rare that an admiral transforms himself into the head of a university college. But Sir Herbert Richmond has been Master of Downing College, Cambridge, since 1936. In **War at Sea To-day** (No. 60) he can write both as scholar and serving sailor on our present naval problems. These are, in the main, three: the use of sea-fighting forces, the provision of proper naval bases, and the supply of sufficient merchant shipping. He laments the facile manner in which our politicians of the between-war years forgot or ignored the dangerous lessons of the 1914-1918 war. The Treaty of London, for example, limited the tonnage of British destroyers to 150,000—less than a quarter of what had proved necessary "to save the Empire from collapse a few years earlier." His comments on the present naval situation are enlightening.

Mr. Ivor Thomas explains to his readers **Who Mussolini is** (No. 59), and here the series steps down from the level of study to that of propaganda. The *News Chronicle* is not the best angle from which to approach Italian Fascism and its leader. Mussolini is pilloried for having turned from Socialism to Nationalism. But does this stamp him necessarily, as Mr. Thomas suggests, "as a man who cared solely for himself and not for ideas?" A similar line of argument might be applied to several figures in English public life. Throughout he is regarded as an adventurer—with the one motive of personal aggrandizement. Is it not possible that he may have been genuinely inspired by patriotic feeling? Mr. Thomas tones down the chaos and disorder of the Italy of 1920 and 1921. One takes exception to the statement that the Vatican responded to Mussolini's overtures "exactly as he wished" and to the further assertion that his policy of "favouring the Church" ensured that "he could count on a sufficiently large volume of Catholic support to embark upon a policy of aggression." What finally gave him this support was not the Lateran Treaty but the application of sanctions by Great Britain. Without wishing to defend or justify the Italian Duce, we do think that it matters how he is tackled.

SCIENTIFIC

Father Henry Gill, S.J., had intended to write a fuller account of Father Boscovich's work, but various causes, the last of them being the outbreak of war, prevented him from consulting the necessary documents. And so in **Roger Boscovich, S.J., Fore-runner of Modern Physical Theories** (H. M. Gill and Son, 7s. 6d. n.) he has confined himself to showing some of the "contacts" between the theory of Boscovich, as put forward in his "Theory of Natural Philosophy" and the views of modern scientists. Father Gill hopes that this brief study may inspire someone to undertake a full-dress biography of this pioneer scientist. The introduction to the present work gives a short life of Father Boscovich, and recalls his connections with this country. In 1760 he paid a visit

to England, met Dr. Johnson, and was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society. More recently his theories have been revived by Lord Kelvin and J. J. Thomson. Father Gill provides for the non-specialist a short account of some modern scientific theories and then shows that there are points of similarity between these and the opinions of Roger Boscovich. Thus Boscovich deduced from his law of force a theory of "allowed" and "forbidden" orbits—an idea used by J. J. Thomson in his theory of the orbits of electrons revolving round the nucleus in the atom. Father Gill adds a note on the Bohr atom with its "allowed" orbits. In similar manner he deals with Boscovich's theory of relativity and applies his law of force to account for some phenomena in the theory of light (assuming a corpuscular theory of light, which view Boscovich always held). Lastly, Father Gill gives an approach to wave-mechanics via the theory and by its aid explains the interference of feeble light.

MISCELLANEOUS

Philosophy of History is a dangerous misnomer. You might as well speak of a Philosophy of Ethics or of Economics. Philosophy is one and indivisible. It is a study which draws its materials from all other humane studies and gives laws to them all. Now the proper study of mankind is man. Ethics studies his duty, Economics his feeding, clothing, and housing, and History is the digestion of man's age-long chronicled experience, the biography of the human race. These studies contribute their lessons as premisses to Philosophy, which is the study of man as such. They seek from Philosophy in return the explanation of what man is. Knowledge of our nature is the general ground upon which all particular studies of man's diverse activities are built. It is the foundation and starting-point, not the conclusion, of History as of all the curriculum of the humanities. It is a mistake, therefore, to search in History for generalities or formulas which summarize the interplay of causes in the record of the past. Such formulas (which are not true inductions) serve no good purpose, and they tempt us irresistibly to use them as if they were scientific laws, by which to forecast the outcome of the present situation. But we control the present situation. No law governs its nexus with the future to which it will give place, but our own wills; and our wills are free causes. The future is contingent upon free causality. Only God knows the future, and He knows it not in its causes but in Himself. The task of the historian is therefore to approach the past—whether it be the distant past or the immediate past which is still the bulk of the present, with a clear Philosophy (that is, with a general knowledge of the nature of man) ready in his mind. By it he will understand what he sees.

Mr. W. J. Blyton is not a professional historian, but he has this indispensable philosophical equipment which many an historian lacks. His study of our present discontents, with its title of *To Happier Days* (John Murray, 8s. 6d. n.), is, in consequence, at

once vivid and penetrating. In his ancient saws and modern instances we see ourselves portrayed to the life. It is comfortable to find that though he judges us by the sound and stern old maxims, he judges more mildly than most of our Mentors. He bids us repent and do penance, for the Kingdom of God is nigh. We are told pretty precisely what to repent of—parasitic finance, bureaucracy, pleasure seeking wishful thinking, birth control. Our penance is laid down with judicial severity—a revival of agriculture (without abandoning industry), a heavy burden of armaments, the thankless task of policing Europe. The hope which is set before us is the boon of security in international and social life, and the enjoyment of that rich heritage of our ancient Christian culture upon which this delightful author has himself entered so fully.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

ANDREW DAKERS, LTD., London.

Christocracy. By John Middleton Murry. Pp. 157. Price: 6s. n.

BRUCE PUBLISHING CO., Milwaukee.

A Declaration of Dependence. By Mgr. Fulton J. Sheen. Pp. vii, 140. Price: \$2.00.

BURNS, OATES AND WASHBOURNE, London.

Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England. By Rev. Philip Hughes. Pp. viii, 466. Price: 18s. n. *Catholic Art and Culture.* By E. I. Watkin. Pp. vii, 176. Price: 9s. n. *The Priest's Prayer Book. A Handbook to the Breviary.* By Rev. Christopher J. Wilmot, S.J. Pp. xii, 148. Price: 7s. 6d. n. *Pontifical Ceremonies. A Study of Episcopal Ceremonies.* By Rev. Pierce Ahearne and Rev. Michael Lane. Pp. xv, 358. Price: 15s. n.

CASELL AND CO., London.

Why So Pale? By Margaret Trouncer. Pp. 198. Price, 8s. 6d. n.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, New York. *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.* By Nicholas Murray Butler. Pp. xii, 148.

CORK UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cork.

The Burial of Christ. By Professor Alfred O'Rahilly. Pp. 61. Price: 2s. n.

DACRE PRESS, Westminster.

A Detection of Aumbries. By Dom Gregory Dix. Pp. 72. Price: 3s. 6d. n.

EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE, London:

And the Floods Came. By Arnold Lunn. Pp. 237. Price: 15s. n.

FABER AND FABER, London.

The Nature of Catholicity. By Rev. Daniel T. Jenkins. Pp. 171. Price: 5s. n.

GEOFFREY BLES, London.

Southward Journey. By Halliday Sutherland. Pp. 320. Price: 15s. n.

H. M. GILL AND SON, LTD., Dublin.

A Primer of Church History. By Rev. R. F. Walker, C.S.Sp. Pp. 94. Price: 1s. n.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON, London.

Epitaph for Europe. By Paul Tabori. Pp. 352. Price: 8s. 6d. n.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE, Montreal.

Towards our True Inheritance. The Reconstruction Work of the I.L.O. Pp. ii, 77. Price: 25 cents or 1s. n. *The Fiftieth Anniversary of Rerum Novarum.* By Rev. Albert Le Roy, S.J. Pp. 20. Price: 10 cents or 6d. n.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO., London.

Bowen's Court. By Elizabeth Bowen. Pp. viii, 340. Price: 16s. n. *To Christian England.* By John Armitage.

Pp. vi, 105. Price: 5s. n. *Death and Life.* By Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J.

Pp. xii, 180. Price, 5s. n. *The Fruits of the Spirit.* By Evelyn Underhill.

Pp. vii, 72. Price 3s. 6d. n. "J.O." By Erica Oxenham. Pp. xi, 211.

Price: 3s. 6d. n.

SANDS, London.

Christ's Appeal for Love. Translated from the Spanish by L. Keppel. Pp. 176. Price: 5s. n.

Printed in Great Britain at the BURLEIGH (CATHOLIC) PRESS, BRISTOL